

BR 759 .H86 1896

Hunt, John, b. 1827.

Religious thought in England
in the nineteenth century

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY THE
REV. JOHN HUNT, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
VICAR OF OTFORD IN KENT

AUTHOR OF 'RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND FROM THE REFORMATION
TO THE END OF THE LAST CENTURY.

LONDON
GIBBINGS & CO., LIMITED
18 BURY STREET, W.C.

1896

J. MILLER AND SON, PRINTERS,
EDINBURGH

P R E F A C E

‘I DO not judge, I only record,’ said Goethe, as he followed the great discussion before the French Academy, between Cuvier and St Hilaire, concerning the mutability of species. Some men write critical histories, some philosophical, and others write in the interests of a party ; but merely to give premisses or, at the most, to indicate conclusions has been the object of the writer of this volume. This may not be satisfactory to all readers as most people like a guide, and prefer one who agrees with their present convictions, and this agreement is taken as confirmation of what they already believe, while the impartial record often too plainly indicates that some of the most cherished beliefs must be relegated to the category of what the Germans call ‘stand-points overcome.’ What many once regarded as the very essence of Christianity must often now be set aside as merely amongst the accidents, and the result is that the consolation of many a devout soul is for a time inexorably swept away ; but Milton once wrote, ‘All opinions, all errors, known, read and collated, are of much service and assistance towards the speedy attainment of what is truth.’ To refute error it is often enough merely to state it clearly.

The first and most obvious lesson to be learnt from the record of the religious thought of this century is the necessity for toleration, or the duty of impartially weighing beliefs other than our own. Whatever estimate we make of Revelation no

one can say it is as clear as we wish it to be, or that it is given in the manner that we would have devised. Our wish is to see it written in the heavens and the veil so withdrawn that there would not remain a shadow between. But we can only come to the light by degrees, or it may be that only in this way can the light come to us. The strifes about opinions are manifestations of human infirmity, the outcome of the disposition to determine what Revelation should be and how it should be given, instead of patiently inquiring what it is, and how it has been given.

In the study of religious thought great allowance must be made for the individualities of men's minds. Psychological idiosyncrasies will often account for differences of belief and unbelief. So men's opinions do not make truth. Revelation may be true, though as yet it may not have been fully apprehended by one single person, and no two minds have agreed as to its meaning in every respect. Some will cling to authority rather than undergo the sense of partial uncertainty implied in a process of inquiry. Others naturally tend to see nothing as settled. There is such a thing as a genius for negation.

In the following pages all appellations are used in their conventional sense. Orthodox are not those who hold right doctrine but those commonly called orthodox. Heresy is not taken as that which is wrong but as a departure from the conventionally orthodox. Catholic does not and cannot mean the universal, as there is no universal Church in the sense of one visible organisation which was the original, and is the only consistent idea of a Catholic Church. Protestants are not those who protested at the Diet of Spire, but those who protest against, or stand apart from the Church of Rome. Unitarian is not one who believes in the unity of God with the implication that Trinitarians deny that unity. It merely means those commonly called Unitarians.

The author is aware that a second-hand account of any writer's belief is rarely reliable. It may not be always intention-

ally misrepresented, but as no man understands another man but in the degree that he is like him, so no man understands a system of belief which he does not himself in whole or in part believe. As this is a record and not a criticism, the author has striven not to put forward his own views. He knows, however, how much may be read in a mode, a tone or the turn of a sentence.

He has tried, though he may not have succeeded to imitate the impartiality of Pope Innocent III, of whom it was said that if he had any dispute to settle, he summed up the arguments on each side with so much force that no one knew till he came to pass judgment what his decision was to be.

It is a felt difficulty with this kind of history, that the reader may be sometimes at a loss to know who speaks. The rule has been followed of giving every writer's opinions, as far as practicable and compatible with condensation in his own words, or where this is not done, the author speaks in the name of the writer except when it is very clear that he is speaking in his own person.

Some of the chapters have been left without general headings. The object was to avoid making one writer responsible for what another says, by their being put together in the same chapter. To catagorise is often to prejudge, and to label a group of thinkers might be to libel some of them.

The following pages were in type before the author had seen the Duke of Argyll's recent work on the Philosophy of Belief. This is a luminous representation of the present position of religious thought in relation to science; up to the day and hour that now is, and with unshaken faith in Christianity. The writer is not dogmatic yet a believer in dogma, that is dogma in the sense of careful definition and at the same time he is conscious how liable a definition or dogma is to survive its right interpretation and to become not only useless but injurious.

The author has to express his gratitude to his old and much esteemed friend the Dean of Ripon, for some valuable

suggestions and several corrections, but he is in no way responsible for any errors that may remain. He has also to thank the librarians of Sion College and Dr Williams' library, for their unfailing courtesy and their readiness to let him have an unlimited supply of books, in some cases even relaxing their rules in his favour.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PALEY

On Subscription to Articles of Religion . . .	1
On Regeneration and Conversion . . .	3

WATSON

Against Subscription to Articles of Religion . . .	4
For Revision of the Liturgy	4
For a Comprehensive National Church . . .	5

HORSLEY

Against Morality without Dogma	5
On the Antinomianism of Evangelicals and Methodists	6
On the Jacobinism of Unitarians and Methodists .	6
On Civil Authority	7
On Hades	7

TOMLINE

Against Calvinism	8
Against the Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed	9

BARRINGTON

Against Relaxation of Subscription to the Articles of Religion	10
---	----

PORTEUS

For Revision of the Liturgy	10
For Relief of Protestant Dissenters from Subscription	11

RANDOLPH

On the Increase of Dissenters	11
On the Vanity and Ambition of the Evangelicals .	11
On Conversion	12

CLEAVER

On the Virtue in Sacraments	12
For the Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed	12

PARR

His Liberal Spirit	13
------------------------------	----

GISBORNE

For a Revision of the Articles or a Free Subscription	13
On the Mosaic Record confirmed by Geology .	13

FELLOWES

Religion and Morality independent of Dogma .	14
The Doctrine of St Paul and the Evangelical Clergy is not the Gospel	14

VICESIMUS KNOX

On Internal Evidence, more important than External	14
Church Doctrines taught chiefly among Dissenters .	15

CHAPTER II

DAUBENY

His Guide to the Church	16
The Clergy can remit sin	17
The <i>Methodisms</i> of the Devil	17
Increase of Methodists a sign of the last Perilous Days	17

SIR RICHARD HILL

Answers Daubeny	18
Doctrine of more Importance than Polity . .	18
The Church of England Calvinistic	18

OVERTON

Answers Daubeny	19
---------------------------	----

OVERTON—*continued*

' The True Churchman Ascertained	19
Daubeny's Appendix to the Guide	19
Uncovenanted Mercies, nearly as good as Covenanted	20
Free Interpretation of the Articles	21
Cranmer on Baptism	22

CHAPTER III

THE EVANGELICAL CLERGY

Charles Simeon	23
Truth both in Calvinism and Arminianism . . .	23

ROWLAND HILL

Always professed to be a Churchman	24
--	----

ROBINSON OF LEICESTER

Reproached for his Earnestness	25
Introduced Hymns instead of Psalms	25

ISAAC MILNER

Defended the Bible Society	25
On Baptismal Regeneration	26
On Calvinism	26

JOSEPH MILNER

Defined the Catholic Church as constituted by all True Churches	26
---	----

HAWEIS

On the Increase of the Earnest Clergy . . .	27
Against the Union of Church and State . . .	27

LEGH RICHMOND

On Baptismal Regeneration	28
-------------------------------------	----

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE

His 'Practical View'	28
Its Influence for Good	28

HANNAH MORE

Her Attachment to the Established Church . .	28
Her 'Practical Piety'	29

CHAPTER IV

MARSH

On the Origin of the first Three Gospels . . .	30
Answered by Randolph and others . . .	31
Controversy on I John, v, 7 . . .	32
The 'Crotchet' of Robert Stevens . . .	32
Against the Bible Society . . .	33
Congratulated by a Roman Catholic Priest . . .	34
Defends himself as a Protestant . . .	34
The Eighty-seven Anti-Calvinistic Questions . . .	35
Against Hymns in Churches . . .	36

BATHURST

A Liberal Bishop . . .	36
Supports the Bible Society . . .	36

BURGESS

On <i>Petros</i> and <i>Petra</i> . . .	37
St Paul founded the British Church . . .	37

VAN MILDERT

On Infidelity . . .	38
On the Bible and the Fathers . . .	38
On the Fanaticism of the Methodists . . .	39

MALTBY

On the Truth of the Christian Religion . . .	40
A Liberal Churchman . . .	40
On the Circulation of the Bible . . .	40

FABER

Makes Revelation depend on the Infallibility of the Pentateuch . . .	41
On the Origin of Pagan Idolatry . . .	41
On Baptismal Regeneration . . .	42
On Predestination . . .	43
On Prophecy . . .	44

ALEXANDER KNOX

A Churchman after John Wesley's type . . .	44
Evangelical, Broad and High . . .	45

RENNELL

On God and Nature	47
On Inspiration	47

CHAPTER V

EVIDENCES

Burnet Prize Essays	48
William Laurence Browne	48
John Bird Sumner	49
Bridgewater Treatises	50
Chalmers	50
Whewell	51
Buckland	52
Babbage	52
Chalmers on Evidence	54
Man cannot judge of Revelation	55

CHAPTER VI

CHURCH AND STATE

Origin of the Connection	56
Demand for Ecclesiastical Independence	57
Chalmers on Church Establishments	58
Asks the State for Church Extension	59
Answered by Dr Wardlaw	59
Gladstone on Church and State	60
Noel against the Union of Church and State	61
The Veto Act in the Church of Scotland	62
The Disruption	62
The Church of Scotland Established yet Independent	62

CHAPTER VII

PROPHECY

A Favourite Study with some English Theologians	63
The Pope is Antichrist	64
The Unitarians are the two Witnesses	64

FREERE

Napoleon the great Subject of Prophecy in Daniel	65
Proved to be the wilful King	66

HORSLEY on Prophecy	66
-------------------------------	----

ELLIOT

The Sealed Ones are those who believe in Election	67
The Manchild is the Evangelical Clergy	67
The Beast and his Image are the Pope and Napoleon	68
High Churchmen and the Scarlet Lady	69

CHAPTER VIII

NONCONFORMISTS, ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT

GEDDES

His Modest Apology for the Roman Catholic Religion	71
Credenda of Rome and England, substantially the same	72
A Bible for Roman Catholics	73
Jewish Histories not inspired	74

LINGARD

Answer to Bishop Barrington	76
The Bishop Defended by Phillpotts, Le Mesurier and Faber	77
Lingard's Defence	78

JOHN MILNER

His History of Winchester	79
His 'End of Controversy'	79

CHARLES BUTLER

His Book of the Roman Catholic Church	80
Phillpotts answers Butler	81

INDEPENDENTS

John Pye Smith	82
--------------------------	----

BAPTISTS

Robert Hall	84
John Foster	85

WESLEYANS

Adam Clarke on the Eternal Son	86
Answered by Richard Watson and Richard Treffry	87

UNITARIANS

Thomas Belsham	89
The Unitarian Bible	91

CHAPTER IX

COLERIDGE

On Reason and Faith	93
On the Church, Catholic and National	94

ERSKINE

On Internal Evidence	94
Christianity commends itself to our Moral Nature	96
And to Reason	97

HAMPDEN

The Scholastic Philosophy and Church Dogmas	98
The Church System changed the Aspect of Revelation	99
Opposition to Hampden's Doctrine	100
His Defence	101
Made Bishop of Hereford	102

WHATELY

His Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon	103
Hard to prove that Napoleon ever existed	104
On Party Spirit	105
On the Church	106
His Theology Rational	107

COPLESTON

On Predestination	108
-----------------------------	-----

HAWKINS

On Tradition	109
Against the Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed	110

ARNOLD

On Church Reform	111
----------------------------	-----

ARNOLD—*continued*

On Church and State	112
On the Right Interpretation of Scripture	112

MILMAN

His History of the Jews	113
History of Christianity	114
History of Latin Christianity	114

CHAPTER X

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES

Keble's Sermon	115
Rose on Protestantism in Germany	116
Dean Church on the Oxford Movement	117
Palmer's Narrative	118
Object of the Tracts	119
On the Grace of Sacraments	120
On Baptismal Regeneration	121
On the English Reformation	122
On Latitudinarianism and Rationalism	123
Non-Episcopal Churches tend to Heresy	124
On Reserve in the Communication of Religious Know- ledge	125

TRACT XC

On the Rule of Faith	127
On the Church and General Councils	128
The XXXIX Articles do not condemn the Mass	129
The Letter of the Four Tutors	130
The University condemns Tract XC	131
Wiseman's Letters to Newman	132
Julius Hare compares Newman to a Chinese Juggler	133
DR ARNOLD answers the Tractarians	134
WILLIAM GOODE shows that Apostolical Tradition means the Canonical Scriptures	136
Catholic Consent of little Value	137
Scripture the only Rule of Faith known to the Fathers	138
The Church of England and the Fathers	139

ISAAC TAYLOR answers the Tractarians . . .	140
Gnostic Heresy in the Fathers . . .	141
DR WISEMAN answers the Tractarians . . .	142
Donatists and Anglicans compared . . .	143
A High Church Party among the Donatists . . .	144
DR LINGARD on the English Reformation . . .	145
The King not Convocations reformed the Church . . .	146
R. H. FROUDE and the Romeward Tendency . . .	147
Our Reformers Zwinglian and Erastian . . .	148
WARD'S IDEAL	
The English Church unlike the Primitive . . .	150
Gladstone reviews the Ideal . . .	151
THE 'BRITISH CRITIC' on Bishop Jewel . . .	152
Jewel agreed with the Swiss Reformers . . .	153
The Foreign Influence not to be denied . . .	155
The English Church flooded with Calvinism . . .	155
Laud's Influence on the English Church . . .	156

CHAPTER XI

THE TRACT WRITERS AND THEIR ALLIES . . .	157
Newman tended logically to the Church of Rome . . .	157
Wiseman's Article in the <i>Dublin Review</i> . . .	158
Newman becomes a Roman Catholic . . .	159
Religious Eccentricity in the Newman Family . . .	160
PUSEY remains undeveloped . . .	161
On the Wicked receiving the Sacrament . . .	162
The Bible Critics Unbelievers . . .	162
JOHN KEBLE'S THEOLOGY . . .	163
How far allied to the Romish . . .	164
MANNING on the Unity of the Church . . .	165
On Regeneration in Baptism . . .	166
PALMER on the English Reformation . . .	167
DR HOOK on the <i>Via Media</i> . . .	168
His Sermon before the Queen . . .	169
SAMUEL WILBERFORCE on Tracts for the Times . . .	170

ROBERT WILBERFORCE on the Incarnation	171
DENISON against all Progress	171
Against Civil and Religious Liberty	173
Prosecuted for Heresy	174
CONYBEARE on the Tractarians	175

CHAPTER XII

THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY	176
Hooker and other Calvinists on Baptismal Re- generation	177
Mant on the same	178
Scott and Biddulph answer Mant	179
Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration	180
Edward Irving on the same	181
The Gorham Case	182
BISHOP PHILLPOTTS	183
On the Tracts for the Times	184

CHAPTER XIII

JULIUS CHARLES HARE	
On Spiritual Influence	187
On the Victory of Faith	188
Defence of Luther	189
FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE	
On Subscription to Articles of Religion	191
On the Kingdom of Christ	192
On Sin and Righteousness in man	193
On the Resurrection	194
On Eternal Life and Eternal Death	195
Controversy with Mansel	196
KINGSLEY	197
F. W. ROBERTSON on the Atonement and on Baptism	198

CHAPTER XIV

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

The Education of the Human Race	200
Bunsen's Biblical Researches	201
The Study of the Evidences of Christianity	203
The National Church	204
The Mosaic Cosmogony	205
The Tendencies of Religious Thought	206
The Interpretations of Scripture	207

REVIEWS OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

In the <i>Westminster Review</i>	209
In the <i>Quarterly Review</i>	210
In the <i>Edinburgh Review</i>	210
Petitions and Protests	211

AIDS TO FAITH

Professor Mansel on Miracles	212
Bishop Fitzgerald on Evidences	212
Dr Mc'Caul on Prophecy	213
Prebendary Cook on Ideology and Subscription	213
Dr Mc'Caul on the Mosaic Record	213
Professor Rawlinson and the Pentateuch	214
Edward Harold Browne on Inspiration	214
Dean Ellicott on the Interpretation of Scripture	215

REPLIES TO ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

Edmund M. Goulburn on the Education of the Human race	215
Hugh J. Rose on Bunsen's Researches	216
Professor Heurtley on the Evidences	216
Dr Irons on the National Church	217
Gilbert Rorison on the Mosaic Cosmogony	217
A. C. Haddan on Rationalism	217
Canon Wordsworth on the Interpretation of Scrip- ture	218

JOHN WILLIAM BURGON refutes all the Seven Essayists	219
---	-----

Williams and Wilson Prosecuted	219
The Three Pastorals	220

CHAPTER XV

WRITERS OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

BISHOP TEMPLE	221
ROWLAND WILLIAMS	
On Prophecy	223
HENRY BRISTOW WILSON	224
On the Communion of the Saints	225
On Inspiration	226
BADEN POWELL	
Against Rationalism	227
Becomes Rational	228
MARK PATTISON	
His Autobiography	229
His Renunciation of Puseyism	230
BENJAMIN JOWETT	
On the Epistles of St Paul	230
On the Man of Sin	231
On Natural Religion	232
On Atonement and Satisfaction	233

CHAPTER XVI

BISHOP COLENZO	234
On the Epistle to the Romans	235
On the Pentateuch	235
Against a Book Religion	236
The Numbers in the Pentateuch impossible	237
DR McCAUL answers Colenso	238
Shows the Numbers possible	239

Conjectures answered by Conjectures . . .	240
The Witness of the Heart to the Bible . . .	241

CHAPTER XVII

UNITARIANISM IN ITS LATEST DEVELOPMENT

The Three Stages of Unitarian Theology . . .	242
The Old Paths of Priestley and Belsham . . .	243
The New School	244
JOHN JAMES TAYLER	245
JAMES MARTINEAU	246
On Religion, Natural and Revealed . . .	247
On Creeds and Dogmas	248
On Authority in Religion	249
On Conscience	250

CHAPTER XVIII

JEREMY BENTHAM	251
CHARLES HENNEL	252
SARA HENNEL	253
WILLIAM RATHBONE GREG	255
FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN	256
JOHN STUART MILL	258
THOMAS CARLYLE	261
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE	262
MATTHEW ARNOLD	263
' ECCE HOMO '	
SUPERNATURAL RELIGION	266
FRANCIS POWER COBBE	269

CHAPTER XIX

CONCLUSION

THE XXXIX ARTICLES CALVINISTIC . . .	272
EVIDENCES EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL . . .	273

CHRISTIANITY MUST BE FELT	274
THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE THREE WITNESSES	275
THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT AND THE REFORMATION	276
ANGLICAN ORDERS NOT VALID BY THE CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA	277
CHURCH OF ENGLAND ERASTIAN	278
BAPTISMAL REGENERATION	278
ETERNAL HOPE	279
THE SYMPOSIUM OR NEVER-ENDING PUNISHMENT	281
THE SYMPOSIUM OR INSPIRATION	283
LUX MUNDI	284
WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH	286
THEOLOGY AND EVOLUTION	287
CAIRD'S GIFFORD LECTURES	288
AGNOSTICISM	289
HERBERT SPENCER	290
ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR	291

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER I

BAMPTON LECTURES	292
HULSEAN LECTURES	332
BOYLE LECTURES	338
WARBURTONIAN LECTURES	342

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER II

OMISSIONS

SYDNEY SMITH	346
CONNOP THIRLWALL	347
JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL	348
JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE	349
CARDINAL WISEMAN	351
HARRIET MARTINEAU	352

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER III

STATE OF RELIGION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CENTURY .	354
---	-----

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER IV

BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES	363
-----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX

BISHOPS OF THE CENTURY	397
----------------------------------	-----

ERRATA

There are two errors entirely due to the author.

On p. 177, line 8 from the bottom, it is said of a passage from Cartwright that Hooker quotes it to refute it. Legh Richmond had quoted it as Hooker's, and Bishop Wilberforce or his biographer multiplied passage into passages. On looking again at Hooker it is found that he quotes not to refute but partially to endorse. Cartwright's words are that baptism is 'a seal of the grace of God before received.' Hooker's words are 'a seal perhaps of the grace of election before received.'

On p. 189, line 6, Archdeacon Hare is made to draw a contrast between sober men and the air-blown phantoms of the Oxford Tractarians. The contrast is between the baptismal gift as taught by divines of the school of Hammond and the air-blown phantoms. The proper reading should be instead of 'they were' 'it was that,' for 'them' in the next line read 'these.'

Page 3, Note, for 1773 read 1737.

„ 23, line 5, for 'Cullottisme' read 'Culottisme.'

„ 131, „ 34, dele the comma after 'system.'

„ 142, Note, for 'F. G.' read 7, 8.

„ 174, If 'awoke' is not right it ought to be. It sounds better than 'awaked.'

„ 184, Note, for 'Totness' read 'Totnes.'

„ 194, line 37, for 'shipusing' read 'ship using.'

„ 207, „ 14, dele comma after 'Ambrose.'

„ 211, „ 1, dele the period after 'play.'

„ 240, „ 9, insert 'thousand' after 'six hundred.'

„ 249, „ 34, for 'man' read 'minds.'

„ „ 36, for 'root of' read 'real.'

„ 251, Note, for 'Sir' read 'The Honourable.'

„ 266, line 36, for 'noting' read 'noticing.'

„ 268, „ 6, for 'doctrine' read 'doctrines.'

CHAPTER I

PALEY, WATSON, HORSLEY, TOMLINE, PORTEUS, RANDOLPH, CLEAVER,
PARR, GISBORNE, FELLOWES, VICESIMUS KNOX

THE beginning of a century does not of necessity make a new era in religious thought. The break in the division of time is arbitrary, and so would be any similar break in the continuity of development.

The most prominent theological writers at the dawn of the century were Paley, Watson, Horsley, Tomline and Porteus. They really belonged to the previous age, but must be noticed here not merely because they lived partly in this century, but to gather up the threads which connect the past with the present.

William Paley¹ entered Cambridge in 1768. The religious atmosphere of the University was at this time what is called liberal, or Latitudinarian. The great subject in agitation was subscription to the Articles of Religion. Paley's friend and early patron, Edmund Law, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, had written against it.² The Bishop's argument was that the Christian religion is in itself very simple and suited to all capacities, but it had been overlaid by dogmatic creeds and metaphysical subtleties. The terms of Church Communion in the early ages were very simple, such as 'Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' In later times there grew up a

¹ Born 1743, d. 1805.

² 'Considerations on the Principle of requiring Subscription to Articles of Faith.'

system of abstruse speculative credenda. The Reformers returned to Scripture as interpreted by reason. But Protestants were soon divided. Creeds or confessions were drawn up to promote unity, but they only increased separation. Impositions increased and still go on increasing. Subscription, if enforced, should be interpreted not as approbation, but as submission, such as we give to the law of the country. Conformity to the Prayer Book, so far as to use it, ought to be sufficient, or if we must subscribe to Articles of Religion or to Creeds they should be expressed in the words of Scripture.

Paley defended his patron, who had been answered by Thomas Randolph. He showed that the imposition of creeds was only consistent where there was a claim to infallibility. Creeds made or imposed by those whose good fortune had raised them to the high places of the Church were not more likely to be sound than those made by private persons. As a matter of fact, the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were no longer believed either by the rulers of the Church or by the ordinary members. That kind of theology was now taught only by Dissenters. The excrescences which had grown on the Church system should be cut away, and all controverted subjects excluded from the Liturgy. Some of the Articles might be omitted, and those that were retained might serve as memorials of the terror once held over freedom of inquiry.

Paley's chief works were his 'Elements of Moral and Political Philosophy,' in which he defined virtue as 'doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God and for the sake of everlasting happiness,' the *Horæ Paulinæ*, showing the undesigned coincidences between the Epistles of St Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, and so witnessing to the genuineness of those books, the 'Evidences of Christianity,'¹ which was an elaboration of the arguments of the Anti-Deistical writers and the 'Natural Theology.' The last alone belongs to this century. It is a collection of illustrations of the argument for Theism from evidence of design in nature. The author himself described his works as consisting of the

¹ Paley's works, belonging mainly to the eighteenth century, are spoken of more fully in vol. iii of 'Religious Thought in England from the Reformation,' etc.

evidences of natural and revealed religion, and the duties resulting from both.

We may only mention further in anticipation of controversies of which we shall have to speak, what Paley has said on conversion, repentance, regeneration, and their relation to baptism.¹ In the primitive Church these things were identified. When anyone was baptised his conversion was assumed to be genuine. St Peter wished the converts on the day of Pentecost to be baptised for the remission of sins. St Paul calls baptism the washing of regeneration. This language we continue to use when there is no supposition of conversion, and when it is not even possible. To speak of such persons as converted or regenerated should be done with extreme qualification and reserve. Such expressions as 'born of God,' 'new creatures and sons of God,' were full of meaning when applied to those who had come from heathenism to Christianity, but in our circumstances they mean perhaps nothing at all. The object of this sermon was to recommend caution in the use of Scripture language, especially to those who imagine they have perceptible influences of the Holy Spirit, and identify those influences with regeneration. In a later sermon² the reality of regeneration or conversion is admitted, but not as necessary for all. Those who have never been indifferent to religion, nor alienated from it, do not stand in need of such a radical change as is generally understood by regeneration or conversion. The change may be sensible and sudden, but not of necessity. The wind bloweth where it listeth. The effect may exist though there be no knowledge of the day or the hour of the operation of the Spirit.

Richard Watson,³ Bishop of Llandaff, was another Cambridge man, likeminded with Paley. He was a Whig in politics, a Church reformer, a liberal theologian, tolerant of Nonconformists and of all men who thought honestly for themselves. He engaged early and eagerly in the controversies about subscription and Church reform. He avowed his intention to purge the Church from 'all the common dregs of Popery' and to effect 'the final abolition of spiritual

¹ See a Sermon at the Visitation of the Bishop of Carlisle in 1777.

² On the Doctrine of Conversion.

³ B. 1773, d. 1816.

tyranny.’¹ He doubted if subscription to Articles of Religion was necessary for the maintenance of an established Church. There are certain things which the civil ruler might require of the teachers of religion, such as that they should not teach Atheism, Deism, Popery, or passive obedience, but he should not require subscription to speculative doctrines. The clergy should no more be bound to the theology of Fathers, Schoolmen or Reformers, than university tutors and lecturers are bound to the problems of Aristotle, the metaphysics of Plato, or the astronomy of Ptolemy.

The Liturgy needed revision.² To speak of the danger of innovation was ‘stale and contemptible cant.’ The reign of his present Majesty, George III, had seen great innovations for the public good. There were many things in the Liturgy which tended to make men unbelievers. Such were the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, which, though believed by no one, still continue to be repeated in that conservative spirit which clings to what is exploded and obsolete. This spirit was incarnate in the clergy, who as a body were always the enemies of progress. The Pagans worshipped their gods long after they knew them to be but idols. The people of England supported the Church of Rome long after Wycliffe had convinced them of its errors and corruptions. No one age has a right to prescribe what is to be believed by the ages that are to follow it, or to bind men to interpret the Scriptures as they have been interpreted in past times. If we must have human creeds let them be in the words of Locke or Clarke or Tillotson, and not made by councils of contentious bishops. In a National Church there should be the greatest possible freedom. The disciples of Calvin should be tolerated as well as the disciples of Arminius, and if the prevailing belief of the country should become Unitarian, the Church should be the same, and Trinitarians should then have that toleration which is now the right of Unitarians.

It has often happened that when church reformers were made bishops, the spirit of reform has died within them. It

¹ ‘Letters to members of the House of Commons by a Whig Churchman.’

² Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy by a Protestant Churchman.’

was not so with Richard Watson. His development was never arrested. Though he wished to see the nation in one Church, he recognised in Dissent the offspring of that religious liberty which no one would now wish to see abolished. He advocated the civil rights of Roman Catholics, though he believed that in this there was possible danger to the cause of liberty itself, but he hoped that even the Church of Rome would yet be leavened with the spirit of toleration.¹

Samuel Horsley,² successively Bishop of St David's, Rochester, and St Asaph's, was the opposite of Richard Watson in politics and in theology. He had a great name as a scholar, a preacher, and a champion of the rights of the Church. Imperious and impetuous, he stamped the intensity of his character on everything which he either said or did. His charges were not merely advice and exhortation to his clergy, but discharges of fire and fury on his enemies. One of them³ might be described as a discourse against morality if not founded on dogma. Against those whose sermons were mainly on 'practice and on morals' he rolled his Olympian thunder. 'The apes of Epictetus,' he said, 'thought their only commission was to step abroad once in the week in the garb of holiness to preach morality.' The revealed will of God is the ground of practice. This is the source and spring of all right action. The Bishop's words are that a man 'may be in danger of being cast into outer darkness with the whole load of moral merit on his back.'⁴ Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit have the nature of sin. Such are the good work of infidels and atheists as Hobbes, Spinoza and Hume, or of Sectarians like Priestley and Lindsey. Their moral works are not done as God has willed and commanded them to be done, and 'their religion, consisting of private opinion and will worship, is sin, for it is heresy.'⁵

The Evangelicals in the Church and the Methodists out of it tended in the opposite direction. In avoiding the errors

¹ For Watson's Defences of Christianity against Paine and Gibbon, see vol. iii of 'Religious Thought in England from the Reformation.'

² B. 1733, d. 1806.

³ That of 1790.

⁴ The Charges of Bishop Horsley, p. 12

⁵ p. 22.

6 Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century

of Pelagius, they fell into Antinomianism. The Methodists were special sinners, but their 'great crime and folly' was not so much heresy as fanaticism. Their zeal for truth was disorderly. They had an irregular ministry. Laymen meddled with the priests' office, and did not submit to those who had authority over them. The clergy were to make a stand for their commission and to glory in the name of High Churchmen. The Methodists and Unitarians were the great enemies of the Church. They not only led their followers into heresy and schism, but they even infected the clergy with their errors. The remedy was a return to the faith once delivered to the Saints, the clergy to fulfil faithfully their commission, and then the people 'would refuse the draught administered by a strange preacher. The moralising Unitarian would be left to read his dull lectures to the walls of a deserted conventicle, and the field preacher would bellow to the wilderness.'

Horsley often returned to the slaughter of the Methodists and the Unitarians.¹ They taught the principles which had produced the French Revolution, and that was the child of atheism and infidelity. How their principles were received when openly taught was seen in the treatment of Priestley, over whose expatriation the Bishop sung this pæan of triumph, 'The patriarch of the sect is fled. The orators and oracles of Birmingham and Essex Street are dumb.' This was the fate of the open advocates of Jacobinism. The Methodists were its unconscious propagators. Their Sunday schools were nurseries of sedition.

Though Horsley dreaded Antinomianism, to which he believed Calvinism tended, he warned the clergy to be careful how they preached against the doctrine of Calvin. That was an open question in the Church of England, and was not to be made the ground of separation. The Articles and formularies might not be so definitely Calvinistic as those of other churches, but they certainly were not Arminian. The basis of Calvin's doctrine was that of St Augustine, which long prevailed in the Latin Church. The ablest writers in the Church of England in defence of Episcopal government were doctrinal Calvinists. Horsley spoke of Calvin himself in the same terms of admiration which we find in Hooker,

¹ Charge of 1800.

Jewell, and other Elizabethan divines. He was 'a man eminent in his day for his piety, wisdom and learning, and to whom the Reformation in its beginnings was much indebted.' Many who preach against Calvinism as a great heresy are often found to be preaching against Christianity itself and the general faith of the reformed churches.

Two sermons of Horsley's were very famous. One was the 30th of January sermon, in which his political opinions were prominent. He spoke of the folly of speculating and disputing on such high subjects as the authority of sovereigns. It did not originate in any compact with the people, though it may be limited by them as happened at the glorious epoch of the Revolution. The other sermon was on 'The Descent into Hell.' The place to which Christ descended was not the Gehenna of the lost, but Hades or Paradise, which was supposed to be in the bowels of the earth. Here Christ preached to the spirits in prison, that is the Antediluvians who repented and were looking for His advent. To this place went also the thief on the cross. That Paradise should be called a prison seems incongruous, but it is explained that a prison is merely a place of custody. The practical use of the doctrine was to confute the idea of the soul sleeping till the resurrection.

George Pretyman,¹ who took the name of Tomline, was Bishop of Lincoln and afterwards of Winchester. He wrote 'Elements of Theology,' the second half of which is an Exposition of the Articles of Religion. He also wrote 'a Refutation of Calvinism,' which gave rise to much controversy. In many respects Tomline was liberal, but in the main a type of the severe Churchman. His hatred of Calvinism was simply hatred, and the spirit in which he wrote of it contrasts unfavourably with the judicial wisdom of Watson and Horsley. He was not content with denying that the Articles were Calvinistic, he even advanced the thesis that some of them were written expressly in opposition to the doctrines of Calvin. Art IX, which says that man is 'very far gone from original righteousness,' was understood as not teaching total depravity or entire want of original righteousness. Art XIII says that

¹ B. 1750, d. 1837.

'works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of the Spirit are not pleasing to God, but have the nature of sin.' The Bishop's interpretation of this, is that such works are not 'perfectly pleasing to God,' or that they do not rise to the standard of merit. It is added that though all the actions of all persons who have not been brought to the knowledge of Christ, are here pronounced to have the nature of sin, it by no means follows that their actions will, in all cases, exclude them from pardon and salvation. 'Millions who have never heard the name of Jesus, and have been a law unto themselves, will be redeemed and blessed for ever through the merit of His death.' This was very rational theology, but whether or not it is agreeable to the Articles of Religion we need not try to determine. Art. XVIII says that 'Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men can be saved,' so it is not enough that a man 'frame his life according to the light of nature.' This is explained, that no one is saved in virtue of his religion, whatever it may be, without the merits of Christ, that the Article does not confine salvation to any sect of Christianity, nor exclude those who have not heard the gospel. This again is very rational theology, but the Article reads as if it meant that men must hear of the name of Jesus and believe in it before they can be saved.

To make an Arminian bridge over Art. XVII was a work worthy of the most ingenious pontiff. This Tomline attempted. He was not content with the ordinary interpretation that the Article only taught moderate Calvinism, or that it could not be Calvinistic because it was guardedly silent on reprobation. Notwithstanding the solemn manner in which it introduces the subject of 'predestination to life,' speaks of 'a counsel secret to us' and of 'vessels made to honour,' the bishop says that it only means the election to privilege of those to whom God had made known the gospel. So this is the election of which the Article says that 'the godly consideration' of it is 'full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable comfort to godly persons,' but 'a most dangerous downfall for curious and carnal persons to have before their eyes this sentence of God's predestination.' The Bishop gets over the difficulty by taking the predestination which is dangerous to refer to the

doctrine of Calvin, while the predestination taught in this Article is that which is full of comfort.

Of the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, Bishop Tomline wrote, 'I am ready to acknowledge that in my judgment, notwithstanding the authority of former times, our Church would have acted more wisely and more consistently with the general principles of mildness and toleration if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. Though I firmly believe that the doctrines themselves of this creed are all founded on Scripture, I cannot but consider it to be both unnecessary and presumptuous to say "except every man do keep them whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."'

The Evangelical or Methodist clergy said a great deal about the necessity of regeneration or being born of God. This language conflicted with the idea of regeneration in baptism. The baptismal service distinctly says that the baptised are regenerate by the Holy Ghost. If this be the same thing which the Evangelical clergy mean by regeneration, they were mistaken in speaking of the necessity for baptised persons being born again. Bishop Tomline thought he had settled the question by confining the term regeneration to the baptismal act, and calling what the Evangelicals called regeneration by the name of renovation or renewal. This distinction was supposed to have the authority of many Fathers, Reformers and Theologians of the Church of England. The Charge of 1800 lamented the 'rapid growth of atheism and infidelity.' But it appears that a worse enemy than either of these, or both of them together, was found in the Methodists. These 'fanatics,' while they believed the doctrines of the Church, renounced its authority and reviled its ministers.

At the close of the eighteenth century, the oldest bishop on the bench was Barrington of Durham.¹ His life extended far back into the last century, and his influence may be said to have reached to our time. He is remembered as the princely and munificent Prelate, and few bishops have had the opportunity of dispensing so much patronage or of bestowing it on so many eminent men. It is enough to mention Paley, Phillpotts, Sumner and Stanley Faber.

¹B. 1734, d. 1826.

In the life of Barrington we read the complex character of the Church of England. He was descended on both sides from Puritan families, who had stood by the Commonwealth and the Westminster Confession. His father, Lord Barrington, was a Presbyterian, and like his friends, Locke, Collins, and Lord Somers, a zealous advocate of toleration. Shute Barrington was Bishop of Llandaff at the time of the Feathers' Tavern Petition for the relaxation of subscription to the Articles of Religion. The petition found in the Bishop a strenuous opponent. He maintained that Articles of Faith were indispensable in an Established Church. His opposition incurred severe reproach. He was reminded of his Puritan ancestors, the Shutes and the Barringtons. His conduct was contrasted with the tolerant and liberal principles of his father, from which he had departed, at a time when his influence might have helped to bring the Church into harmony with the spirit and progress of the nation. The Bishop, however, was no enemy to liberal principles. In his first Charge as Bishop of Salisbury he spoke in high terms of commendation of his predecessors in the see, mentioning especially Burnet, Hoadly and Sherlock. It was with a feeling of awe that he took the seat once occupied by such men.

Beilby Porteus,¹ Bishop of London when the century began, might be called an Evangelical, that is, so far as he had any party character. In him we may mark the transition from the learned and leisurely prelates of former days to the active bishops of the present time. Porteus first became known beyond the University by a sermon in answer to a tract called 'The man after God's own heart,' which was intended to ridicule the religion of the Jews. His argument was that David was not so called for his private virtues, but for his public conduct, not for the purity of his life, but for his abhorrence of idolatry.

In 1722, Porteus had been the promoter of a private petition to the bishops for a revision of the Liturgy, 'particularly those parts which all reasonable persons agreed stood in need of amendment,' and in the hope that 'moderate and well-disposed persons of other persuasions' might be brought over to the Established Church. The bishops decided that it was

¹ B. 1731, d. 1809.

more prudent to let the Liturgy remain without revision, and Porteus acquiesced in the decision, being satisfied that he had expressed his judgment. The Bishop favoured a Bill to relieve Protestant Dissenters from Subscription to the Articles of Religion. It was enough that persons licensed to preach should make a declaration that they were Christians and Protestants, and that they held the Scriptures as their rule of faith.

The position of some other bishops, though less eminent than those we have mentioned, may be briefly noticed. John Randolph was consecrated Bishop of Oxford in 1799. He was translated to Bangor in 1807, and succeeded Porteus in the See of London in 1809. In 1870 he preached a sermon at the consecration of Bagot, Bishop of Bristol, from which we learn his views of ecclesiastical polity. The Christian Church being a society, in the nature of things it must have government. The New Testament gives no definite polity. It must therefore often be inferred from passages difficult of interpretation. As in a civil state, the government may be a monarchy or a republic, and obedience is proper in either case. So too in the Church, we read of deacons, presbyters, and a higher class endowed with authority. In the Church of England we retain these three orders, but pass no judgment on those who have a different polity. Our Reformers were careful not to unchurch the foreign Protestants.

Like all the bishops of his time, Randolph was greatly alarmed by the increase of Dissenters. Under this term he embraced the Evangelical clergy. He could understand the old Nonconformists who had a reason for their dissent, but not those who were separate and had no plea for separation. The Bishop was, however, still more displeased with those who, holding the same doctrines as the Methodists, remained in the Church. They are described as seeking the Church's orders, sheltering themselves under her wing and making great efforts to purchase livings, that they might be filled with clergy of their own type. In London they were getting into their hands all the Lectureships in the city churches. Their motives were vanity and ambition, and their idea of conversion was subversive of the Church's order as well as of her doctrine. Among the baptised there is no distinction of con-

verted and unconverted. The latter term was only applicable to infidels and heathens. The Welsh clergy were congratulated on their being free from the 'prevailing fanaticism.' Some of their flocks might be infected, but the shepherds were uncorrupt. They were beyond the reach of enthusiasm.¹

In 1787, William Cleaver² succeeded Porteus as Bishop of Chester. In 1800 he was translated to Bangor, and in 1806 to St Asaph. The writer of a brief account of his life says, that he 'had a refreshing shower of mitres.'³ Cleaver, like Bishop Watson, was the son of a clerical schoolmaster, who had no fortune to give his sons except Greek and Latin. He was well read in Homer and the Greek tragedians; his theology was merely that in fashion at the University in his time. He hated the Evangelicals, and attributed to the efficacy of sacraments 'every virtue under heaven,' not only regeneration but justification and sanctification. He defended the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed against the animadversions of Bishop Tomline. He denied that the clauses were damnatory, or that they condemned any one. They simply declared the right faith, and set forth the danger of those who departed from it. He did not regard the language of the Articles of Religion as ambiguous, nor as expressing fully the views of the compilers, nor even of Convocation, but intended 'to give that moderated statement of every point in discussion which might meet the consent of all.'

There are yet a few more names to be noticed who represented the inheritance of the present century from the past. The first of these is Samuel Parr,⁴ who lived a long life in daily expectation of a bishopric which never came. His voluminous works are pervaded by a liberal spirit, otherwise they have no special theological interest. He was charged with heresy on the Trinity, but there are some churchmen who can see heresy in its invisible germs. Parr was satisfied with answering that his views of the Trinity were the same as Bishop Butler's. He defended all liberal churchmen, and was tolerant of the most reprobate heretics. Of Priestley, who

¹ Charges of 1808 and 1810.

² B. 1742, d. 1815.

³ See Annual Biography and Obituary for 1817.

⁴ B. 1745, d. 1825.

had been the victim of Bishop Horsley's intemperate invective, he wrote, 'I must look to him as something more than a mere lucky experimentalist, when I know that his virtues in private life were acknowledged by his neighbours, admired by his congregation, and recognised almost by the unanimous suffrage of his most powerful and most distinguished antagonists.'¹ Of Bishop Hoadly, the terror of High Churchmen, he wrote, 'The mild and heavenly temper which breathes through his works had spread its conspicuous influence over the minds of those who do and of those who do not accept his speculative opinions.'²

Of another well abused dignitary of the Church he wrote, 'Archdeacon Blackburn suspected that opportunities might arise when the transition from the Church of England to the Church of Rome would not be difficult to a certain class of ecclesiastics whose stiffness in theology, and whose predilection for a hierarchy, he was not accustomed to treat with much tenderness.'

For the Evangelical Clergy Parr had as little affection as for the stiff theologians. He spoke of them contemptuously as believing they were 'taught of God.'³ The Holy Spirit, according to some divines, had long ceased to work, and God was not now the Teacher of men.

The next name is that of Thomas Gisborne,⁴ Prebendary of Durham. He was famous as a poet, preacher and moralist. His theology might be called Evangelical, but with a liberal tendency which prevented his identification with any party. He defended those who preach doctrine from the charge that they did not also preach morality.⁵ He found no form of Ecclesiastical polity in the New Testament, and he advocated a free subscription to the Articles, or better still a revision.

Gisborne wrote a treatise called 'The Testimony of Natural Theology to Christianity.' It was intended as a supplement to Paley. The arguments were drawn from the new science of geology. The earth was full of disorders and ruin. As it could not have come in this state from the hand of the Creator, there was evidence of the fundamental doctrine of Christianity that man is fallen. Such desolation could only proceed from

¹ Works, vol. iii, p. 284. ² Ib. iii, 686. ³ Works, vol. iv, 544-5.

⁴ B. 1758, d. 1846. ⁵ Dedication of Sermons to Wilberforce.

the transgression of God's law. It is a punishment for sin. The disturbed state of the strata is a confirmation of the record of Noah's flood.

Robert Fellowes,¹ an unbeneficed clergyman, wrote some books which would even now be reckoned very advanced theology. In one of them² he advocated the setting aside all creeds and all doctrines except such as concerned life and conduct. Religion and morality are independent of dogmas. The avowed object of the writer was to delineate the character of Jesus, and from that to show that Christianity was something simple and practical. The method of the argument was to deny that Jesus had taught doctrine, and to depreciate the theological bias of St Paul, on the assumption that he taught merely doctrine and not practical religion. His followers were the Evangelical clergy, who, while they profess to preach Jesus, set forth doctrines about Him which they call 'the gospel.' The conclusion is, that 'whether we square our faith by the Creed of Athanasius, Arius, or Socinus we shall enter into life if we keep the commandments.'

Yet another variety of religious thought may be found represented by Vicesimus Knox.³ He may be taken as mediating between the other parties. He duly appreciated Paley's arguments for Christianity from external evidences,⁴ but their force was limited to meeting the objections of gainsayers. The evidence, which is convincing, is that which moves the heart, and through the heart the understanding. The Evangelical clergy assumed, though they did not say, that the devout man had an inward faculty by which things spiritual were discerned. We should, therefore, instead of preaching external evidences addressed to the intellect, habituate men to the temper and precepts of Christianity. Successful preachers believed in a divine influence, and spoke to the heart. Till the rise of the Methodists this was never reckoned fanatical or enthusiastic. It is the old doctrine of the Church of England in the Prayer Book, which taught that there was an inspiration and a regeneration of the Spirit. To this truth we have the testimony of the Elizabethan and Jacobean

¹ B. 1771, d. 1847.

² A Picture of Christian Philosophy, 1799.

³ B. 1752, d. 1821.

⁴ See 'Christian Philosophy.'

divines. Bishop Hall spoke of the deep mysteries of godliness, which were 'a sealed book to the great clerks of the world.' They knew of whom they had heard, but 'the spiritual man knew in whom he had believed.' Jeremy Taylor said that 'every man must do in his station that which God requires of him, and then he shall be taught of God all that is fit for him to learn.' Again he says, 'theology is rather a divine life than a divine knowledge.' John Smith says that 'the best acquaintance with religion is the knowledge taught of God.' Bishop Pearson spoke of 'an internal illumination of the understanding.' The reaction against Puritan theology in the time of Charles II tended to regard religion as nothing more than morality, and all teaching of the Spirit as mere enthusiasm. The doctrines of the true Churchmen are now chiefly to be found among the Dissenters.

CHAPTER II

DAUBENY, SIR RICHARD HILL, OVERTON

THE books and pamphlets written against the Evangelicals and Methodists would make a vast library. Bishops in their charges, curates in their sermons, and learned divines in Bampton Lectures denounced the 'fanatics' and 'enthusiasts.' The Evangelical clergy at this time were Calvinists in doctrine, and as a rule they did not violate the order of the Church. Those who now bore exclusively the name of Methodists had passed into actual, though unintentional separation, and had a ministry of their own. The intrinsic value of the books written against them is small, but their historical interest is great. They show the subjects which were then discussed and the spirit which prevailed in the discussion. Two things were continually on the surface, the Calvinism of the Articles of Religion, and the question if Episcopacy was an essential or merely an accident of a true Church. In past times many of the most strenuous advocates of the divine origin of Episcopacy had been Calvinists in doctrine, but the Evangelicals, while holding the doctrines of Calvin and preferring an Episcopal Church, made Episcopacy a matter indifferent.

In 1798 Archdeacon Daubeny published a dissertation called 'A Guide to the Church.' This was intended as a word of warning to all Evangelicals, and especially to William Wilberforce, who had recently written a book called 'A Practical View of Christianity,' also to those Methodists who are in a state of semi-separation, and to the Dissenters who are

wholly outside of the Church. Daubeney was a good specimen of the dogmatic churchman. His own opinions were to him absolute truth, and those of all who differed from him were absolute error.

The failing of those for whom the 'Guide to the Church' was written, is briefly summed up as making doctrine of more importance than ecclesiastical polity. The Church was the foundation of doctrine, the pillar and the ground of truth. Its constitution was a hierarchy of bishops, with priests and deacons. Without this Church there could be no Word of God rightly preached, and no sacraments rightly administered. Separation from the Church is schism, and no amount of learning or piety can make it anything but schism. For fifteen hundred years there was no thought of dispensing with the divinely appointed priesthood, and when this was done it was only on the plea of necessity. But it was a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints. The priesthood, in virtue of their commission, have the power to remit sins. Those who preach without this commission are the successors of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. The Spirit of God cannot accompany an irregular ministry, but those who have the commission, however unworthy they may be in themselves, or however wicked in their life, have the Spirit of God because their office is holy. Judas had a devil, but he could baptise for the remission of sins. The Methodists professed to be guided by the Spirit, but they were the greatest deceivers that had ever gone out into the world. St Paul exhorted his disciples to put on the whole armour of God that they might be able to withstand 'the *Methodisms* of the devil.'¹ The increase of the Methodists so far from being evidence that it was the work of God, was a sign that the last perilous days had come. Because the clergy did not preach Calvinism, they were charged with not preaching the Gospel. The 'wandering preachers had estranged the public mind from the respect which was due to those who held the divine commission.' The 'annals of modern itinerancy were disgraceful.' The Bible

¹ See Sermon on the trial of the Spirits. A Methodist might have answered by a passage in St Chrysostom, *Homil. iv, de penit.* 'We ought to be thankful to God, who, through many Methodisms (διὰ πολλῶν μεθοδεϊῶν), cures and saves our souls.'

Society, the Lancastrian system of Education, and other modern inventions were helping the Methodists in the fulfilment of the predicted apostasy of the latter days.¹

Sir Richard Hill,² a veteran Calvinist, answered the Archdeacon in a series of 'Letters' called 'An Apology for Brotherly Love.' He avowed himself a devoted churchman, but it had never been any part of his belief that there was no salvation for those who were separate from the Church of England, or that there could not be a Church without bishops. Doctrine was of more importance than ecclesiastical polity, just as the truth, which the Church was instituted to preserve is of more importance than the Church. The temple which 'sanctifies' the 'gold' is not greater than the gold. The clothing of the king's daughter may be excellent, but her praise is that she is all glorious within. Sir Richard Hill said he had no wish to change the present government of the Church of England, but he could not forget that our most learned theologians, after the labour of many years, had not yet decided whether in the primitive Church there were three orders or only two. Government of some kind indeed there must be, God's vineyard must have a wall, but it is not said of what material that wall must be built. Cranmer, following St Jerome, had argued for the identity of bishops and presbyters. Even some Popes had called themselves presbyters of the Roman Church. So little is said in the Scriptures of Church polity that every age or country may adopt what best suits its wants. The Church of England has never refused the right hand of fellowship to Non-Episcopal Churches.

Then followed the familiar historical evidence for the Calvinism of the English Church at the Reformation. Bucer and Peter Martyr were Calvinists, Baret and Baro were censured by the Heads of Houses in Cambridge for denying predestination. The Lambeth Articles had the sanction of the Archbishops of Canterbury, of York, and of the Bishop of London. Quotations from many of our most famous theologians in the time of Elizabeth and James proved that at that time the consentient or Catholic belief of the Church of England was Calvinistic.

¹ See Charge of 1805.

² B. 1732, d. 1808.

The Evangelical party had another advocate in John Overton,¹ who wrote 'The True Churchman Ascertained.' Daubeney did not admit that Wilberforce, Hannah More, and those whom they represented, really belonged to the Church of England. They were nominally members, but dissenters, both as to doctrine and polity. George Croft, another clergyman, who was much opposed to the Evangelical party, described them as teaching more than was taught in the Articles. Thomas Ludlam had spoken of them as 'the whole tribe of those who called themselves the serious clergy.' The Anti-Jacobin Review openly denounced them as 'heretics and schismatics.' Overton insisted that the clergy who had not themselves been irregular should not be held responsible for the irregularities of others. His argument was limited to the defence of those who belonged to the Church of England, and the issue was narrowed to the question whether the doctrines of the Articles were taught by the Evangelical party or by those represented by Archdeacon Daubeney. The Articles were to be taken in the strictly literal and grammatical sense. This sense was to be determined not by any heterogeneous publications in the transition era of Henry VIII, but by the writings of the Reformers. The quotations were from Nowell's Catechism, Ferrar, Hooper, Coverdale, Jewel's Apology and Thomas Rogers who wrote the first commentary on the thirty-nine Articles. The conclusion was that the Articles of Religion are Calvinistic, though the Calvinism was not so strongly expressed as in some other Confessions.

Daubeney answered Sir Richard Hill in an 'Appendix to the Guide.' He said doctrine and polity were equally divine. They were joined together by God, and what God had joined together no man should put asunder. The doctrine was the light, and the Church the candlestick. The doctrine was the truth, and the Church was the pillar and the ground of the truth. The Church supports the truth with the authority it has received from Christ. The multitude of sects which sprang up in the time of Cromwell was evidence enough of the importance of episcopal government. The battle of episcopacy had been fought and won. No dissenter of

¹ The Vicar of St Crux and St Margaret's, York.

learning or character now entered into combat with a Churchman. On the authority of Peter Heylin, it was shown that the Scotch minister, Henderson, was so worsted in argument by King Charles I, that he took a fit of melancholy, went home and died.

The Archdeacon declared his belief in salvation by works in the sense that something must be done by man in order to be saved. In Adam all died, but by baptism all are brought into a new state. Though men cannot do works pleasing and acceptable to God without the grace of the Spirit, yet they can with the help of baptismal grace. Eternal life is the gift of God, on condition of faith, repentance and obedience, 'works so performed have something to do with the sinner's acceptance before God.'¹ The seventeenth article, as Bishop Tomline has shown, was written against the theology of Calvin. Peter Heylin had recorded that Cranmer refused the intervention of Calvin in the work of the Reformation in England, and as to the Lambeth Articles, though sanctioned by Archbishop Whitgift, Queen Elizabeth threatened him with a præmunire if he dared to publish them. Daubeny's position was summed up by a writer in the *Christian Observer* thus: 'There may be a true Church without religion, and religion without a true Church.' Another writer defined it, 'That there might be a true Church in which the word of God was not preached.'

The Archdeacon had committed all members of Non-Episcopal Churches to the uncovenanted mercies of God. But the sound of this was more terrible than the reality, as the uncovenanted mercies were almost as good or hardly inferior to those of the covenant, for the benefits of Christ's death were as extensive as Adam's fall, so that 'multitudes might be saved through Christ who had never heard His name.'²

Overton defended the Evangelical clergy not only from the animadversions of High Churchmen, but from those of the more rational party. In this, the only point of interest was the question of subscription. The Evangelical as well as the High Church clergy professed to take the Articles in their literal and natural sense, as intended by those who

¹ p. 199.

² p. 233.

wrote them, though they differed as to what was the real sense. The rational Clergy admitted that they did not receive them in the sense of the compilers, but claimed a right for themselves and others to qualify their subscription.

Paley had said 'Those who contend that nothing less can justify subscription to the Articles than the actual belief of each and every separate proposition contained in them, must suppose that the legislature expected the consent of ten thousand men, and that in perpetual succession, not to one controverted proposition, but to many hundreds.'¹ Dr Powell of Cambridge said that 'As new discoveries have sprung up, explanations have to be gradually framed and adopted.' Dr Hey said the forms might be left in words but altered in meaning, in which case it may be either said that they grow obsolete or that the law which enjoins them is tacitly repealed, and a tacit repeal is of equal value with an express one. The literal sense of every form can be the true sense only while it is new; it gets a new and acquired sense. He showed how the divines of the eighteenth century had gradually come into opposition to the doctrine of the Article on justification by faith. Bishop Shipley said there had been such 'improvements' as entirely reformed the doctrine of the Church. George Croft, a writer, quoted as an authority at that time, said that the Articles certainly favoured enthusiasm, and he did not wonder that they generated Evangelicals and Calvinists. Against all such, Overton said in the words of Strype, that the doctrines of the Articles were 'interwoven with industry into the forms of public worship.' Moreover, the very Convocation which framed the Articles declared their object to be the 'avoiding of diversities of opinion and the establishing of concord touching the true religion, and the Royal Declaration forbids varying or departing from them in the least degree or offering any new sense on any Article.

The question of the Calvinism of the Church of England had been discussed by Dr Laurence in his Bampton Lectures. It was revived in 1822 by the publication of Reformation Documents.² The Anti-Calvinists rested mainly on the documents of the time of Henry which Cranmer sanctioned. Those who took the other side doubted if they expressed

¹ M. Phil., b. ii, ch. xxii. ² Laurence and H. J. Todd.

Cranmer's real sentiments. These are found in the documents of Edward's time, when Cranmer's influence was greater than it had been in the previous reign. The contrast is seen in several passages. 'The Institution of a Christian Man' says 'By the sacrament of baptism men obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God—so that children dying in infancy shall be saved thereby and else not,' again 'by virtue of this holy sacrament men and children obtain grace and remission.' On the other hand, the *Reformatio Legum* says 'their scrupulous superstitions must be considered as impious who tie together the grace of God and the Holy Spirit with the elements of the Sacrament as openly to affirm that no child born of Christian parents can attain salvation who shall be carried away by death before he can have been brought to baptism, which we hold to be far otherwise.' Again in Edward's Catechism, where the discourse is of justification by faith, it is said, 'which thing baptism represents and puts before our eyes, namely that we are by the Spirit of God regenerate and cleansed from sin—water signifies the Spirit. Baptism is also a figure of our being buried with Christ.'

The sentiments of Cranmer and Ridley are nowhere definitely expressed. Bradford was a decided Predestinarian, and sent a treatise to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer when they were in prison for their approval, which being obtained, says Strype, the rest of the divines in and about London were ready to subscribe it also.

CHAPTER III

SIMEON, ROWLAND HILL, ROBINSON, ISAAC AND JOSEPH MILNER,
Haweis, Legh Richmond, Wilberforce, Hannah More

THE Evangelical serious or earnest clergy, as they were called by their followers, the fanatics and enthusiasts, as they were called by those who opposed them, were more conspicuous for their personal influence than for any depth or originality of theological speculation. Their religion rested mainly on feeling and experience. It was enthusiasm in the proper and literal sense—God working within. Yet they were never deficient in the dogmatic spirit. Few have been more persistent in maintaining that religion and their special dogmas were inseparable.

Evangelical theology has always been more or less the theology of Calvin, but this has been gradually disappearing, and now is found, where it is found at all, only in a mitigated form. The spirit too has in some measure changed. It is not so dogmatic as it once was. The lisping Ephraimite is not so closely watched, and sometimes it is admitted that there may be other interpretations of the Christian faith.

The Evangelical movement had its origin in the last century. Those who were living at the beginning of this belonged to the second or third generation. The most prominent of these was Charles Simeon,¹ who for a long life-time was a great spiritual power in Cambridge and throughout England. His first text and the great theme of all his ser-

¹B. 1757, d. 1836.

mons was 'Christ and Him Crucified.' With Simeon, and the party to which he belonged, this meant that man was fallen, that he could not help himself, but that he had help in a Mighty One, who by His death had brought redemption to the world. The cross was the centre. There satisfaction was made to divine justice. Simeon was a strict Churchman in the sense that he delighted in the services of the Prayer Book and adhered to the Articles of Religion in their literal, natural, and original meaning. His theology was Calvinistic, but qualified by the admission that though there was a system of theology in the Scriptures, it had really been found by neither Calvinists nor Arminians. There was truth on both sides, which could not be made to fit into either system. The truth was larger than the dogmatic creed. This was illustrated by the wheels of a complicated machine. They might be moving in opposite directions and yet subserve one common end.¹ So truths, apparently opposed to each other, might yet be reconciled in a higher or deeper ground.

Rowland Hill² was in the zenith of his strength and fame when the century began. He was the brother of Sir Richard Hill, and like the other members of the family, was early associated with the serious or earnest men of the time, especially those who were doctrinal Calvinists. He sympathised with the six students expelled from Oxford, who practised what in those days were reckoned irregularities. This stood in the way of his ordination. Six different bishops to whom he applied refused to ordain him. He was at length made deacon by Dr Willis of Bath and Wells, but he never succeeded in getting higher orders. Surrey Chapel, where he preached and read the Church of England service for fifty years, was built for him. He always professed to be a Churchman. To his congregation he once said, 'I have a right to declare my predilection for our Establishment. Her public Liturgy is a public blessing to the nation, nor is there a Church upon earth that so much promotes the abundant reading of the Word of God.'

An eminent preacher of the party at this time was Thomas Robinson of Leicester.³ His first sermons were listened to by

¹ Preface to *Horae Homil.*

² B. 1744, d. 1833.

³ B. 1749, d. 1813.

crowds of hearers, but his earnestness subjected him to the charge of being a Methodist. He answered that if to be in earnest was to be a Methodist, then apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself, must bear this reproach, and he did not object to be in the same category with them. He had to give up one curacy because he introduced hymns in the place of the psalms of Tate and Brady. When he first appeared in St Mary's, Leicester, and gave out a hymn, the congregation started a psalm in opposition, and the two blended together in harmonious confusion. On his decease after thirty years as Vicar of St Mary's, Robert Hall said of him, 'that by the manifestation of truth he commended himself to every man's conscience, as in the sight of God, and the success which followed was such as might be expected from such efforts.'

Isaac¹ and Joseph Milner were also prominent members of the Evangelical party. They had come under the influence of Wilberforce, and mainly adopted his religious opinions. Isaac, Dean of Carlisle, defended the Bible Society against Dr Marsh, declaring his loyalty to the Prayer Book, though he wished the Scriptures to go forth as their own interpreter; and in this work he rejoiced in the co-operation of Nonconformists. He also wrote against Bishop Mant on regeneration in baptism, arguing from the Church Catechism that as repentance and faith were necessary in those who were to be baptised, and as they were not found in infants but in their sureties, regeneration in baptism must be hypothetical. These conditions had to be fulfilled before the blessings of the Sacrament were realised. There was no actual regeneration till the change was manifest, so that conversion and regeneration were the same thing.

In seeking the meaning of any words in the Liturgy or Articles, we should be guided by the Scriptures on which the formularies of the Church profess to be grounded, also by Church history and the principles of the Reformation. From these sources, light is often thrown on the meaning of a doubtful word. Baptism was at first only administered to adults. It was the baptism of believers. This came to be identified with regeneration, because the persons either were, or were supposed to be, genuine believers. When the custom

¹ B. 1751, d. 1820.

was established of baptising infants the same term was used, but though we speak in this general way in the baptismal service, we cannot say that persons are really regenerated merely because they have been baptised. A distinction is found in Augustine between regeneration and conversion, but it is not in the Scriptures. Milner professed to be Calvinistic, but the subject of the divine decrees he reckoned too abstruse and difficult to be profitable for instruction. He never introduced it into his sermons.¹ He once said 'You are my witnesses that though for many years past, both the pulpit and the press have teemed with controversial discussion respecting Calvinism and Calvinistic tenets, you have never heard from me during a period of twenty years' experience, one single word on these contentious and difficult subjects.'

Dr Kipling, Dean of Peterborough, had written a book, in which he argued against the Calvinism of the Church of England, from the general tenor of the Liturgy and the plainness with which it set forth the universality of the atonement. Milner answered, that when we wanted to ascertain the doctrine of the Church, we should follow the Articles rather than the general and less definite words of the Liturgy. The Articles were written expressly to define the dogmatic position of the Church. Inferences were made from Calvin's doctrines which Calvin himself would not have admitted. He did not deny the faculty of the will and make men unaccountable. The doctrine of original sin, as taught in Art IX, is 'a most important article in the Christian scheme, all other doctrines of Christianity being closely connected with it.' This is the root, other doctrines are the branches which the root bears. The description of original sin in our Articles is strong, decided, and amply verified by the facts of human life.

Joseph Milner wrote a 'History of the Church from the Earliest Times.' Here we have the Evangelical interpretation of Church history. The Catholic Church consists of all true Churches, that is, those in which the true Word of God is preached and the Sacraments rightly administered. The Church of Rome, being corrupt, does not come under the category of true Churches. Ecclesiastical history had usually

¹ Sermon on Heb. xii, 14.

been written without regard to religion, but religion constitutes the Church which consists of the devout men of all ages in all Churches.

Thomas Haweis,¹ Vicar of Aldwinkle, and chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, was also associated from his youth with the Evangelical clergy. His testimonials for ordination were signed by Walker of Truro and others of the same party, but Lavington, Bishop of Exeter, refused to countersign them, for in the judgment of the Bishop, such persons were not 'worthy of credit.' Haweis wrote a 'History of the Church,' which included the history of his own time. He was able to speak triumphantly of a great religious revolution which had been effected by those called Methodists. He had seen in the course of his lifetime an immense increase of the serious clergy. Where formerly scarcely one could be found, there were now 'hundreds of Rectors and curates preaching the doctrines once branded as Methodism.' To this history were added Dissertations. One was on the conduct of Theodosius in seeking uniformity by means of penal enactments. Joseph Milner had defended Theodosius, but Haweis thought that such civil regulations as those of Theodosius, did not further the interests of the Church. Milner's defence of Theodosius was virtually a defence of civil establishment of religion, to which Haweis was opposed. The civil magistrate should have no power to punish heresy. Such interferences with religion have never been of any service. The Church is best without any kind of civil support. The alliance with the state has ever been meretricious. The corruptions and divisions of the Church which existed before Theodosius went on the same notwithstanding his penal laws. Another Dissertation was on Schism, which is defined as the separation of one body of Christians from another on whatever ground. The Church is a society of faithful people who have the pure word of God preached and the sacraments rightly administered. Where there is no pure word, there is no true Church. The inference, from this position is that separation is not always without justification, nor need schism imply anything criminal.

Legh Richmond² was better known by his popular religious tracts, than by his theological opinions. He was a true type

¹ B. 1734, d. 1820

² B. 1772, d. 1827.

of his party, sincere, earnest, intensely religious. In the *Christian Observer* in 1804 he criticised Archdeacon Daubeny, specially on the doctrine of regeneration in baptism. The baptismal service seems to make the two things contemporaneous, as if baptism were always regeneration; but this is explained, that the Church usually speaks in the name and character of that part which truly believes. It is always assumed that the persons using the services of the Church are what they profess to be. Every baptised infant is supposed to be regenerated, so is every baptised adult. In the last case it is clearly a charitable presumption, and there is no reason for its not being the same in the former.

The chief lay pillars of the Evangelical party in the beginning of the century were William Wilberforce¹ and Hannah More. Wilberforce's 'Practical View' was a defence of the Evangelical doctrines, under the form of moderate Calvinism. It is strong on the corruption of human nature and the atonement as the means of deliverance. The subject did not afford scope for originality, but the earnestness of the writer was manifest, and the book had great influence in calling men to seriousness.

Hannah More's² works were popular, and helped to make fashionable the outward profession of religion, while they showed that religion was something not merely outward. In her time, and in some measure, through her influence, religion came to be spoken of with respect in many circles where before it had been treated with contempt. Bishop Porteus, in a Charge to his clergy, bore public testimony to the influence of her works. Her friend, Archdeacon Daubeny, had some fears that she was not sincerely attached to the Church of England. He dreaded the little reverence she had for mere external religion, and he thought she leaned to 'fanaticism and Calvinism.' In her tract 'On the Religion of the Fashionable World,' she says that she was sincerely attached to the Establishment, and she regarded 'its institutions with a veneration at once affectionate and rational.' She did not believe that, since the time of the Apostles, there had ever been a Church in which the public worship was so solemn, yet so cheerful, so simple and yet so sublime, so full of fervour and

¹ B. 1759, d. 1833.

² B. 1745, d. 1833.

at the same time so free from enthusiasm, so rich in the gold of Christian antiquity, yet so astonishingly exempt from its dross.' She was so far removed from 'fanaticism' that she wrote 'All the doctrines of the gospel are practical principles. The word of God was not written, the Son of God was not incarnate, the Spirit of God was not given only that Christians might obtain right views and possess just notions. Religion is something more than mere correctness of intellect, justness of conception and excellence of judgment. It is a life-giving principle. It must be infused into the heart as well as into the understanding. It must regulate the will as well as direct the creed. It must not only cast all opinions into a right frame, but the heart into a new mould. It is a transforming as well as a penetrating principle.'¹

¹ 'Practical Piety,' chap. ii.

CHAPTER IV

MARSH, BATHURST, BURGESS, VAN MILDERT, MALTBY, FABER,
ALEXANDER KNOX, RENNELL

THE next generation of theological writers may be said to belong more to this century. The line is not to be drawn definitely, as the time of influence and activity is not always proportioned to age. Among the writers of this period the most eminent was Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Llandaff and afterwards of Peterborough.¹ He had lived some years at Göttingen and had acquired a knowledge of the German language, in those days a rare accomplishment for an Englishman. While Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, he translated Michaelis' 'Introduction to the New Testament,' adding notes and a 'Dissertation' of his own² on the origin of the first three gospels. This may be called the introduction of German criticism into England, but it did not then take root. In the Dissertation Marsh supposed the first three Evangelists to have used a common document, which in some places they abridged and to which they added matter from other sources. The document was supposed to have been that called by Origen 'The Gospel of the Twelve' or by Justin Martyr 'The Memorials of the Apostles.' Matthew probably retained the original Hebrew, while Mark and Luke translated it into Greek. The verbal agreement of the three Evangelists was the foundation of this hypothesis.

The publication of this 'Dissertation' produced one of those panics to which the orthodox world is as subject as volcanic

¹ B. 1758, d. 1838.

² Began in 1723, finished 1801.

regions to earthquakes. Here was a book written by a Professor of Divinity, in the University of Cambridge, published at the expense of the University, the tendency of which was indirectly to modify if not to overturn the received doctrine of infallible inspiration. A host of combatants rushed to the defence. Daniel Veysie argued that if Marsh's statement of the facts was correct, they would favour the hypothesis of a plurality of documents more than of one.

The Regius Professor of Oxford, wrote 'Remarks on Marsh's Hypothesis.'¹ This was anonymous, but the writer was John Randolph, afterwards Bishop of London. He dreaded the danger of such speculations to young and inexperienced persons. The hypothesis wanted simplicity and it made the Evangelists 'copiers of copyists, compilers of former compilations from a farrago of gospels or parts of gospels of uncertain authority.' The silence of the Fathers for many centuries as to the existence of any such documents was reckoned proof sufficient that they never existed. 'The Gospel of the Twelve' was spurious and the 'Memorials' of Justin were the present gospels. The verbal agreement on which the hypothesis rested was mostly confined to the discourses of Jesus and was much exaggerated. It is inferred that the discourses were often repeated before they were committed to writing, and were the only documents the Evangelists had before them.

Marsh repudiated the inference that he made the Evangelists 'copiers of copyists.' The documents from which he supposed them to draw in addition to the common document were communications made by the Apostles, and therefore of good authority, establishing the authenticity, integrity, and credibility of the gospels. All antiquity confirms the belief that St Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and the silence of the Fathers concerning this common document is easily accounted for by their ignorance of the Hebrew language, and the original document having been superseded by more complete history. The 'Memorials' were a single gospel and not the four. This hypothesis of a common gospel had the advantage of going back to the preaching of Christ. It was the commentaries of the Apostles committed to writing, while

¹ 'Or Cautions to Students of Divinity.'

the contrary hypothesis left everything to the uncertain vehicle of oral tradition.

The publication of the Translation of Michaelis involved Marsh in a controversy as to the three witnesses in I John v, 7-8. Michaelis said that this passage was not found in any Greek manuscript, but was interpolated into the Latin text, having been first written in the margin. Erasmus refused to insert it in the two first editions of his Greek Testament, but promised to do so in the third, if it could be shown to exist in any old Greek manuscript. Such a manuscript was said to exist in England. A transcript of the passage was sent to him and lest the Church of Rome should have any cause of complaint, it appeared in all subsequent editions. Luther refused to admit it into his translation of the Bible. Marsh defended Michaelis which brought him into controversy with Archdeacon Travis who had already written 'Letters to Gibbon,' concerning his note on the subject in the 'Decline and Fall.'¹ Travis had already been proof against the arguments of Porson, and after that was not likely to be convinced by any one.

Marsh said that the only Greek manuscript now extant containing the passage was not older than the fourteenth century. No Greek Father quotes it nor is it found in any of the old versions nor in the text of the old Latin manuscripts. Some had it in the margin or interlined by a later hand, and where it is found it has no fixed place, sometimes before, sometimes after, the eighth verse. It is a well-known matter of history that it came from the Latin into the Greek. It was quoted from the Vulgate in the Acts of the Lateran Council of 1215, which were written originally in Latin but translated into Greek and sent to the Greek Church in the hope of promoting the union of the two Churches. About a hundred years after this, the passage was first quoted by the Greek Church.

The note in Gibbon, is 'The three witnesses have been established in our Greek Testament by the prudence of Erasmus, the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors, the fraud or error of Robert Stevens in the placing of a crotchet, and the deliberate falsehood or strange misinterpre-

¹ Ch. xxxvii, sec. ii, n. 120.

tation of Theodore Beza.' The Archdeacon defended these writers but the 'crotchet' of Robert Stevens formed the main subject between him and Marsh. In the disputed passage which begins with 'in heaven' and ends with 'earth' Stevens put a semicircle after 'heaven' and an obelus before 'in' to signify that these words were omitted in seven Greek manuscripts which he had consulted. After Stevens' New Testament was published, a critic suspected that the compositor had made a mistake and put the semicircle after 'heaven' instead of after 'earth' so that instead of making the whole passage an interpolation he only made the first three words. No one had ever seen a Greek manuscript with merely these three words omitted. Those who defended the passage considered the 'crotchet' as evidence for the genuineness of the rest, but when of the seven manuscripts, four, which were in the Royal Library in Paris, were examined they were found to be without the whole of the disputed passage. Travis went to Paris and examined the manuscripts for himself, but as he was determined not to be convinced he gave it as his opinion that these did not belong to the seven to which Stevens had referred. Marsh found one in the University of Cambridge which had no trace of the interpolation either in whole or in part. This he believed to be one of the seven, but this also Travis did not admit.

Marsh had made a great stride in the matter of criticism and free handling of the Scriptures, but in all other respects, he was incapable of progress. He was among the first to oppose the Bible Society because it circulated the Bible without the Prayer Book. They had always been sent out together by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, but in this new society, the Bible was to go alone, and Dissenters were to have equal power with Churchmen. He recommended that both parties should have their own society, and with the Bible circulate comments inculcating their own special theology. It was his wish not to limit freedom of opinion, either in doctrine or worship, but religious dissensions led to political, and it was imprudent for Churchmen to throw the strength of the Established Church into a society which consisted largely of Dissenters. Churchmen who did not agree with Marsh said that they yielded to none in their allegiance to the Church

and their appreciation of the Prayer Book, but 'the Bible and the Bible alone was the Religion of Protestants.' To circulate the Bible without the Prayer Book showed no want of fidelity to Church principles. So long as we had religious freedom there would be Dissent, and therefore it must be accepted as a necessity. Though we cannot always get unity of opinion we may have union of hearts.

This opposition provoked Marsh to write in self-defence. He published 'An Enquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book to the People.' It left them to interpret the Bible for themselves, and so in danger of being led away by the Dissenters who professed to draw their distinctive theology from the Bible. The Church's interpretation should always accompany the Bible. This was intended by the Reformers who gave us both Bible and Prayer Book. To omit the latter would be dangerous both for Church and State, especially in the education of children. Chillingworth's generalised Protestantism bore its fruit in the Long Parliament, when the Liturgy was abolished, and we may see the same fruit again.

The principle that the Church's interpretation should always accompany the Bible brought Marsh into collision with new enemies, or rather into alliance with unknown friends. A Roman Catholic priest¹ expressed his gratitude to the Cambridge Professor for advocating the side of the Catholic Church against her many foes. Catholics had always rested on the Bible, and the Church's interpretation was only given for the benefit of the poor and the unlearned. The professor was compared to the dove which could find no place to rest the sole of its foot till it returned to the ark. Chillingworth's principle dispensed with creeds, but now there was a healthy tendency to return to the bosom of the Church.

The priest's congratulations evoked a defence in 'A Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome.' Marsh complained that he had been misunderstood. He entirely repudiated the idea of tradition as an authority, and virtually adopted the Protestant principle of Chillingworth. His advocacy of the circulation of the Prayer Book did not rest on any doctrine of the authority of tradition but was

¹ Peter Gondulphy.

solely in the interests of the Established Church. He only meant that as the Bible is the test of a Christian so is the Prayer Book of a Churchman.

As a bishop, Marsh continued to retrograde. He resolved to drive from the Church all who held the doctrines of Calvin, which, at that time, meant substantially the Evangelical party. He was not content with pouring out his episcopal wrath in a Charge but had recourse to other measures. An Evangelical rector had nominated a curate. Before giving the licence, the Bishop examined the curate as to his views of regeneration in baptism. The latter took the view that it might precede or follow the symbolical rite. The Bishop in the circumstances had little difficulty in persuading the curate that a real regeneration always accompanied baptism. After the curate had come over to the Bishop's view, the licence was granted. The rector soon found that his curate was not teaching the doctrines he had agreed to teach before his nomination and wished to dismiss him, but the Bishop refused to sanction the dismissal.

The Bishop now determined to be beforehand with the whole of that race of the clergy. He formulated a series of eighty-seven questions, bearing on the most abstruse points connected with Calvinistic theology, and required from those who were to be licensed a full and explicit answer to every one. A curate, nominated by an Evangelical rector, refused to answer and denied the Bishop's right to exact from him any more minute account of his doctrine than was required by the Thirty-nine Articles. The Bishop said he was bound by the fifty-eighth canon to know what his clergy were to teach, and such was the variety of interpretation put on the Articles that mere legal subscription was not sufficient.

It was finally decided that a bishop had no right to make any test of doctrine beyond the Articles of Religion. Sydney Smith wrote¹ 'The early Reformers leant to Calvinism and would, to a man, have answered the Bishop's questions in a way that would have induced him to refuse them ordination or curacies, and those who drew up the Thirty-nine Articles would in all probability have given an interpretation

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Nov. 1822.

of them, like that which the Bishop condemned as a disqualification for Holy Orders.'

The Bishop's last effort to stem the tide of progress that was surging all around him was his opposition to singing hymns in the churches. Some of the modern hymns are described as abounding in 'blasphemy and vulgarity,' but the avowed object was to carry out the spirit of the Act of Uniformity, and this could not be done if the clergy were allowed to introduce any hymn books at their pleasure. These new hymns might be the means of undermining the Church's doctrines. As we have an authorised version of the Bible so should we have an authorised version of the Psalms. The metrical version in the Prayer Book had indeed no authority beyond that of the King's Printer, but for the sake of uniformity and soundness in the faith, we should all cling to it. This was the last plea for Tate and Brady, Sternhold and Hopkins. Bishop Marsh deserved to be celebrated in verse. He was probably in Hannah More's mind when she wrote of one who

'Feared 'twould show a falling state
If Sternhold should give way to Tate;
The Church's downfall he predicted
Were modern tunes not interdicted?
He feared them all, but crowned with palm
The man who set the hundredth psalm.'

Henry Bathurst, Bishop of Norwich, continued the succession of liberal bishops. Though descended from a Non-juring family, and in fact the son of a Non-juror, he early renounced the principles of his ancestors and ardently promoted all measures for political and religious freedom. He rejoiced in the progress of toleration¹ and expressed his belief that Roman Catholics were now more tolerant, and Dissenters less acrimonious than they had been in past times. He defended the Evangelical clergy as men whose enthusiasm consisted only in zeal in performing the duties of their calling. He supported and defended the Bible Society in the face of remonstrances from the clergy of his diocese. He was ready to share in every undertaking for the furtherance of the

¹ See his Primary Charge.

gospel of Christ. Though inalienably attached to the Church of England, he was willing even to renounce that if it stood in the way of his working with his fellow-Christians. The end to be gained was of more importance than the means to be used. To the cry of the Church in danger, he answered that there was danger, but it was from those who raised the cry. Some thought the Church of England of more importance than Christianity itself, but the outward fabric was not worth maintaining if charity, the guardian angel of the inner fabric was gone.

Bishop Bathurst was one of the early promoters of the National Society, but he wished it to be national in reality and not merely in name, and to undertake the education of all without reference to Creed. He was the first of modern bishops to disregard Episcopal routine, and refused to be guided by rigid legality. He ordained candidates from Scotch Universities as being of equal standing with those from Oxford or Cambridge. He even ordained without titles; one of those who were so ordained was Graham the poet of the Sabbath, another was Charles Sumner afterwards Bishop of Winchester.

Thomas Burgess, Bishop successively of Llandaff and St David's was also one of the first Episcopal supporters of the Bible Society. He was ardent for Chillingworth's rule, 'The Bible and the Bible alone,' and this with the utmost loyalty to the Prayer Book in its proper place. He advanced if he did not originate an argument against the supremacy of St Peter in the variation of the gender between the two Greek words which mean rock in the text, 'Thou art Peter'¹ and on this rock² I will build my Church.' The foundation was then not the man Peter but the confession he had just made that Jesus Christ was the Son of God.

The Bishop had also a theory that the Church of Rome was founded by St Paul and not by St Peter. In the Epistle to the Romans St Paul spoke of imparting to them a spiritual gift. The Church was really founded when this gift was imparted. Not only did St Paul found the Roman Church, he also founded that of Britain which was entirely independent of the Church of Rome. From this it follows that the Papal

¹ Petros

² Petra

Church in England was an intrusion of a later date. The Reformation, therefore, only re-established principles which had been violated by the Bishops of Rome.

The successor of Barrington in the See of Durham, was William Van Mildert.¹ He had succeeded Marsh in the See of Llandaff in 1819. In 1802-1805 he was Boyle Lecturer. His subject was a history of infidelity with a refutation.² The argumentative part was not new. The language in which the thesis was expressed showed the attitude of the Lecturer. It was 'that infidelity, in all its forms, from Paganism in the early times to the philosophical, metaphysical sceptical unbelief of the present day, is not an unintentional error, but the wilful corruption of known truths, and therefore an undoubted sin.' According to this the unbeliever is not a sincere person with difficulties in the way of belief, but simply a perverse sinner.

Van Mildert was Bampton Lecturer in 1814. His subject was the interpretation of Scripture.³ The first qualification of the interpreter was the moral one. The Bible was its own interpreter where there was the right disposition to understand. It was supreme as the rule of faith, above all dictates of the Church, of reason or even of spiritual illumination. But great deference was to be given to the opinions of the Fathers. Some of them were conversant with the Apostles. The claims of the later Fathers are diminished by distance of time; yet even they had advantages for understanding the Scriptures which we have not. The extraordinary gifts to the Church were not yet withdrawn. We have not these gifts, but we have reason which is not so depraved but that we can distinguish what is of faith and what can be discovered by the natural intellect. The 'diversities of gifts' having ceased, there is now no authorised interpretation of Scripture.

The amount of *credenda* to be deduced from the Scriptures on these principles of interpretation was a question to be considered. Some had reduced all articles of faith to one—

¹ B. 1765, d. 1836.

² The title was 'An Historical View of the Rise and Progress of Infidelity, with a Refutation of its Principles and Reasonings.'

³ The title was 'An Enquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation.'

that Jesus is the Messiah. Some defined them as the fundamentals on which all Christians were agreed, while others reckoned nothing essential to faith, which had not a practical tendency. The Lecturer defined the *credenda* as the articles commonly received as orthodox with 'a due estimation of the Church's sacraments and the Church's priesthood' for these were 'interwoven into the very substance of Christianity and inseparable from its general design.' The orthodox doctrines with 'the Church and sacraments' had been held in all ages of the Church. Some objected that the Church was once Arian, to which the answer was, that the hierarchy only became Arian under the compulsion of the civil power.

In his Charge of 1821, Van Mildert, as Bishop of Llandaff, lamented the increase of Methodist and Dissenting meetings. He lamented also the progress of infidelity and in some places of Unitarianism, a phase of Christianity 'hardly stopping short of disbelief in revealed religion.' But the real and great enemy of the Church was fanaticism, that is the preaching of the followers of Wesley and Whitfield. This was the thorn in the flesh, the torment of the orthodox and decorous bishops and clergy. It is not clear that Van Mildert distinguished between the theologies of the different sects, even of the Methodists. To 'the wandering schismatic,' he ascribed the doctrine of salvation without man's co-operation, but simply by an absolute decree.

The Bishop was essentially a prudent Churchman, his progress never exceeding that of the whole ecclesiastical body. He lamented the 'spurious liberality of sentiment which regards each persuasion with an equal degree of complacency,' and he opposed all such measures as those to which belonged what was called 'Catholic Emancipation,' for the Roman Catholic religion was idolatry and superstition.

Edward Maltby succeeded Van Mildert in the See of Durham. He was a pupil of Dr Parr and was strong in Greek. He appeared as a theological writer early in the century. After the manner of Paley he pursued the argument from undesigned coincidences.¹ He did not propose a formal proof, but only undertook to set forth such considerations as made Christianity credible, and the books on which it rested

¹ See Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion, 1802.

worthy of credit. The New Testament had marks of genuineness and authenticity, that is, according to the definitions of Bishop Watson, the books were the work of those whose names they bear, and contain what is true. The New Testament was written in Greek, but not in that of the natives of Greece. This is seen in the omission, the redundancy or new application of Greek particles. The manner of thinking and mode of expression show that the books of the New Testament were written about the time in which it is commonly believed they were written. They are artless and consistent. They have the mark of the situation and circumstances which answer to Horace's criterion of the credible. There is a variety of characters, and yet all speak as we should expect from their condition and circumstances. There are speeches from Jews of every class, from the rulers of the Sanhedrim to the outcasts of the people, and of Gentiles from the civilised Athenian to the barbarous people of Melita. The consistency of details renders the whole credible.

Bishop Maltby as a liberal politician advocated the civil rights of Roman Catholics, and as a liberal Churchman he praised the 'unparalleled zeal and exertions' of Joseph Lancaster in the cause of education. He did not approve of the Bible Society, but on different grounds from those who wished to send with the Bible a traditional interpretation. The historical parts of the Bible were liable to be misunderstood, and the prophets were comprehensible only to learned men. The intention of the Bible Society could not be fairly carried out till the poor were better educated and the Bible retranslated. The Bible might be sent to the heathen, but it would be wiser first to civilise them and then preach to them the gospel. Maltby liked the Bible Society because it offered a common ground for all Christians, but he doubted if the Bible were necessary for all, or even intended for all. He thought that the Prayer Book and the Articles, in some points, required revision and if this were done, it would reconcile Nonconformists and strengthen the National Church.

George Stanley Faber¹ was Bampton lecturer for the first year of the century, and took for his subject the 'Credibility and Authenticity of the Pentateuch' under the title of *Horæ*

¹ B. 1773, d. 1854.

Mosaicæ. The argument proceeded on the alternative that if the Pentateuch is not infallible there is no revelation. To question the literal truth of the record in Genesis was to reject Christianity. Referring incidentally to geology, the lecturer said contemptuously 'Even the bowels of the earth are ransacked to convict the Mosaic chronology of error.' The code of the Hebrew law-giver is contrasted with the mythological fables of other nations, while the records in Genesis though coinciding with these traditions have yet in themselves internal evidence of their truth. The heathen traditions are supposed to be original, universal and not depending on the Pentateuch. The knowledge of Antediluvian events descended to all nations from Noah. The same traditions are found over the whole earth, but through national vanity adapted by every people to their own imaginary annals. The division of the week into seven days which unlike the day, month, or year, is not an astronomical division, bears witness to the work of creation. In almost every part of the world, the week is a measure of time and there is often a trace of the Sabbath. The conclusion is that Moses was inspired to write an accurate account of creation to counteract the corruption of history.

The Pentateuch is found to have many internal marks of credibility—as congruity of time and place, a thousand little delicacies which give the semblance of reality—so that Moses was neither a dreamer nor one deceived. The Jews always reckoned that the commemorative ordinances, as circumcision and the passover, were evidences that the Pentateuch was written in the time of Moses. The inspiration is proved by the fulfilment of prophecies, such as 'This people shall dwell alone,' the captivity in Babylon and the restoration to Canaan.

Faber deserves special notice as one of our first writers on comparative mythology, though his thesis was fantastic. In his 'Origin of Pagan Idolatry' all mythologies are traced to one original, on the ground that the gods of all nations had a common likeness. The first worship was that of the departed spirits of good men. The gods were dead heroes. The worship of natural objects may be traced in Pagan idolatry, but the gods have also a distinct historical origin. In every religion there is a triad which is traced to the three sons of Adam who married his three daughters. This triad

is repeated in the three sons of Noah. It is the meaning of the Indian Trimurti where the impersonal Brahm is manifested in three persons. According to the doctrine of metempsychosis each of the sons of Noah was animated by the spirit of his father, and that father was himself animated by the spirit of Adam. The universal demon, father of gods and men, triplicated himself and yet continued one. Through all the forms of the gods is seen this one demon or hero god, the ancestor of the human race. On the side of Nature this father was the sun, and the many gods were the sun and moon and other natural objects under different aspects. As the great father was the sun, so the earth was the great mother from whose fruitful womb all existence has proceeded.

In the year 1816 Faber had published sermons on baptismal regeneration. In 1840, he resumed the subject, advocating the same doctrine as in the sermons. The one, however, was baptismal regeneration according to Scripture, and the other according to the primitive Church. He followed the principle that the Fathers were the best interpreters of Scripture, quoting Chillingworth, who to his famous aphorism 'The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants,' added 'The Bible interpreted by Catholic written tradition.'

Three systems are given as held by modern theologians, that regeneration is a federal change of man's state before God, that it is a moral change, that it is both moral and federal, and that baptism is its outward and visible sign. Those who accept the first definition of regeneration believe it to be always connected with baptism. Those who follow the second believe the same, while those who follow the third, as they identify regeneration with conversion, believe it may be *in*, *before* or *after* baptism. The language of the New Testament concerning the new birth cannot be reduced to a mere federal change. It means principally a moral change of disposition, and subordinately a federal change of relative condition.

In the primitive Church regeneration meant a moral change, but with some Fathers, it also meant a federal along with a moral change. Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria speak of the baptised as the illuminated, and this illumination is by baptism. Regeneration is here a moral change. But now comes the question, if all who are baptised

have this regeneration. Cyril of Jerusalem answers with the case of Simon Magus who was baptised but not illuminated. Jerome and Augustine gave the same answer; the latter explaining that though Simon Magus was born of water, he was born in vain, for he wanted charity, without which none are children of God. Augustine allows to baptised infants only a federal change as they are incapable of the moral that is conversion. Baptism is only one medium of Regeneration, and not every one baptised is therefore necessarily regenerated in the sense of a moral change. Clement of Alexandria gives the key to the whole question of baptismal regeneration. He said that as it was impossible to determine the exact time when regeneration took place, it was generally assumed to be at the time of baptism.

Faber thought to settle the doctrine of predestination in the same fashion by an appeal to the early Church.¹ It was not known before St Augustine who was charged with innovation, not only by the Pelagians, against whom he wrote, but by those who agreed with him against the Pelagians. This was purely a question of fact. The charge was fully established and Augustine could not answer it. On Art. XVII, Faber agreed with Laurence, who thought he escaped the obligation to Calvin by supposing that our Reformers followed Melancthon and the Augsburg Confession. Faber says there was no predestinarian theology among the fathers. It began with Augustine, was revived by Calvin and could not be the doctrine of our Articles, as they were not taken from the Calvinistic Confessions.

Faber was also an authority on the interpretation of prophecy.¹ During the 1260 days, which are prophetic years, the Church will be in a state of great depression. The papacy is not Antichrist. It has never denied the Father and the Son, which is St John's mark of Antichrist. The apostacy, however, which was to prevail during these 1260 years, was

¹ The Primitive Doctrine of Election 1836.

¹ A Dissertation on the prophecies that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled relative to the Great Period of 1260 years, the Papal and Mahommedan apostasies and the tyrannical reign of Antichrist or the Infidel Rome and the Restoration of the Jews. 1814.

that of the Papacy which began about 606, when the Pope took the title of universal bishop. The Papacy is the little horn in the West, as Mohammedanism is the little horn in the East, and the wilful king, who was afterwards to come was not Napoleon himself, but the Empire which he established, the infidel kingdom of France. The first angel in the Apocalypse was Martin Luther. The second was John Calvin, the third was the Church of England. It is not necessary to go further.

Alexander Knox, a layman of the Protestant Church of Ireland, may be noticed here. He was a private gentleman who spent his life in the study of theology.¹ He might be described as a High Churchman, an Evangelical or a Broad Churchman, yet in each case, with qualifications and reservations. He was an intimate friend of John Wesley though a much younger man.² He confessed to owing much to Wesley while far from calling him master. Knox might be regarded as a fossil specimen of a race that seemed almost extinct, a specimen of what might be called a Churchman after Wesley's type. He regarded Wesley not only as the greatest Saint, Apostle, Evangelist of modern times, but as one that taught the most rational theology, or the true philosophy of Christianity. Though accepting Augustine's theology without the Predestinarian decrees, he yet followed the system and lived in the spirit of St Chrysostom. He rejected the modern notion of forensic justification, maintaining the necessity of a moral change, or a justification of them that fear God and work righteousness. He also taught that the kingdom of heaven is upon earth, and that we may be members of it now in this world, and reach such a state of perfection as to dread sin more than its punishment and to love righteousness more than its reward.

Knox found in the New Testament a system of doctrine, but one very different from the subtle and metaphysical systems of later times. That system is not merely redemption,

¹ His 'Remains' were published in 1834.

² Wesley wrote to him friendly letters calling him 'My dear Alleck.' He wrote two letters to Hannah More on Southey's *Life of Wesley*, which correct some of the defects of that excellent book and are now reprinted with it.

but a redemption which redeems from all iniquity. It is essentially something practical, something which concerns the life and character. The 'exceeding great and precious promises' had for their object to make us 'partakers of the divine nature.'

The view which Knox took of the Church of England was substantially that of a High Churchman, but he objected to being identified with those of his time who usually bore that designation. In their opposition to Evangelicals, they opposed inward religion and did not believe that men were still taught of God. He took his stand on the Liturgy, the whole tone, spirit, and doctrine of which were what would now be called Methodist. The Liturgy was the *Decus et Tutamen* of the English Church. Under the term Methodist were included the Evangelical clergy, who bating their Calvinism had more of the spirit of the Church of England than those called High Churchmen.

But we must turn to the other side. Knox strongly objected to the Reformers being called the Fathers of the English Church. It knew of no Fathers but those of the Church Catholic. The Reformers never aspired to such a position nor presumed to put their own opinions in the place of Catholic doctrine. They were loyal to the Bible in fundamentals and in secondary matters, they followed *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. The Roman Catholic Church is a strange concrete of truth and error. It has gold, silver, and precious stones, but it has also wood, hay, straw, and stubble. The Reformers simply set aside the error. Cranmer had the misfortune to come under the influence of the Swiss Reformers, but Ridley was clear as to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine, and that in virtue of their consecration, they were the vehicles of a blessing to worthy receivers. This doctrine was in the first Prayer Book, but by the influence of Bucer it was excluded from the second. It afterwards found its way into the Catechism, and by the good providence of God at the revision of 1662, it was again restored in the Communion Service. It was the doctrine of Bertram as opposed to the transubstantiation of Paschasius and was the original doctrine of the Catholic Church. The seed thus deposited in the Prayer

Book was yet to bear fruit as we come nearer to 'the time of the end.' Article XXVIII, with an evident view to this doctrine, says that the body of Christ is not only *received* but *given, taken, and eaten*.¹ John vi is assumed to refer to the Lord's Supper, and so there is an eating of the flesh of Christ after an efficacious and mysterious manner.

On some other questions Knox is more rational. Though far from denying a ritual or always a moral change in baptism, he yet accounts for baptism being called regeneration, from the circumstance that all who sought baptism in primitive times were supposed to be genuine believers. So we may say in faith that all who are baptised are regenerate. He commends confession because of the good it does in promoting the religious life in much the same way as a Methodist class meeting. He was a great admirer of Cudworth, John Smith, and the whole of that school of theologians. He quoted with approbation the words of Whichcot that 'A man is not at all settled or confirmed in true religion until his religion is the self-same thing with the reason of the mind.' To think and to love are the same. Though an admirer of William Law, he strongly condemned Law's principle that the Gospel was to deliver us from 'the rational man in us.'² He recommended a friend to read the Marquis De Renty who was Wesley's favourite among Roman Catholic saints, but to add to his subdued and mortified spirit the luminous and cheerful temper of the Cambridge Platonists.³

Another theological writer, who died young, promised much more than he actually performed. This was Thomas Rennell,⁴ son of the Dean of Winchester of the same name. He published anonymously in 1811, 'Animadversions on the Unitarian Translation or Improved version of the New Testament,' in which he pointed out forced translations and passages perverted from their natural meaning. In 1816 he was chosen 'Christian Advocate' in the University of Cambridge, and in this capacity undertook the refutation of the theories of M. Bichat on the development of life.⁵ The scientific writers

¹ Vol. ii, p. 190.

² Vol i, p. 340.

³ Vol i, p. 132.

⁴ B. 1787, d. 1825.

⁵ The book is called 'Remarks on Scepticism,' especially as it is connected with the subjects of Organisation and Life, being an

whom Rennell criticised may neither have been irreligious nor atheistic, but he regarded them as 'putting laws of nature, vital forces, energies of the mind, in the place of the will and the wisdom of God.' While the old philosophers found God everywhere, the modern men of science found Him nowhere. The devout student in his contemplative survey of nature, sees overwhelming evidence of a creating and superintending Providence. Others ascribe all to secondary causes, but Nature is merely a convenient expression for the uniform action of the Almighty Cause. The French philosophers and their followers in this country make it a substitute for God. They suppose life to be dependent on organisation, and so annihilate the doctrine of the soul's immortality, making man nothing different from the grass on which he treads. These physiologists defined life as an assemblage of those functions which resist death, ideas they called changes impressed upon the substance of the brain by the impact of bodies external to its tissue. Some even ascribed the power of thought to the medullary matter. But it is not matter which influences the brain, it is thought. They are independent of each other, though the connection between them is close. Thought, therefore, is not annihilated with the dissolution of the bodily frame. A plant has simply the principle of life, an animal has volition as well as life, man has life, volition, and soul or understanding.

Another of Rennell's works as Christian Advocate was called 'Proofs of Inspiration on the Grounds of the Distinctions between the New Testament and the Apocryphal Volume.' This had reference to a volume published by William Hone.³ Hone did not in this publicly avow that he had any object in view, but the universal inference was that he meant the Canonical books had no more authority than the Apocryphal.

answer to the views of M. Bichat, Sir T. C. Morgan, and Mr Laurence.

³ Called on the title page 'The Apocryphal New Testament,' being all the Gospels, Epistles, and other pieces now extant, attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, His Apostles and their companions.

CHAPTER V

EVIDENCES

THE eighteenth century was the time of the evidence writers. There are many books on this subject belonging to the early part of this century which may be noticed, not for any originality of argument, but for their historical interest. Some of these are in the form of Prize Essays or endowed Lectures. The earliest are the Burnet Essays, which owe their origin to the munificence of Alexander Burnet, a merchant in Aberdeen, who left money for two essays every forty years. The thesis was, 'The Being, Wisdom and Goodness of God, in the first place independent of Revelation, and in the second place from Revelation.' In 1815, the successful writers were Dr William Laurence Browne, Principal of Marischal College, and John Bird Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

The former argued from the position, said to be admitted both by Theist and Atheist, that something must have existed from eternity. It follows then that either there is a Creator or an eternal world. It is proved that the world is not eternal, first as to its form, and secondly as to its matter. There is no contradiction in supposing the first never to have existed, and as for the second, if primitive matter was necessary, it must always have remained in a rude state. This is called the metaphysical proof of the Being of God. Then follows a refutation of the theories of some of the ancient philosophers, with such as those of Spinoza and Toland among the moderns, who are treated as simply Atheists. Arguments for the Being of God are founded on the fact that man possesses moral and intellectual faculties, on universal consent, and the recent origin of the world, which cannot be shown to be older

than six thousand years, the age assigned to it by Moses. The Essayist supplies the curious information that the writings of Hume, which had done great mischief, are now seldom perused, and will soon be forgotten. The divine Wisdom and Goodness were defended by meeting objections from the existence of evil in the natural world. It is admitted that it is beyond the capacity of man to explain why evil should exist at all, yet we may consider that there is a perfection which is absolute, and another which is relative. Thus evil may be natural, moral or metaphysical. It may be merely privation. There may be a necessity in finite things that good cannot exist without evil. Omnipotence itself cannot impart perfection to created beings. From this necessary defect we may better understand how natural and moral evil are not inconsistent with divine Wisdom and Goodness. When a created being has free agency, there is a possibility of corruption. Scripture solves difficulties which reason cannot solve. Even never-ending punishment may be founded in God's moral government, and so compatible with wisdom and goodness.

Sumner's Essay was called 'Records of Creation.' The argument avowedly rests on the credibility of the Mosaic record of creation. Nature cries aloud that there is a God, and yet to the sages of antiquity she spoke in vain. Natural theology can but show the probability of that being true which Revelation declares. What reason could not discover has been revealed. Three suppositions are possible concerning creation. Either the world must have existed from eternity the same, or it was formed by chance at some unassigned period out of pre-existent material; or it was created by an Omnipotent and Intelligent Being. The first is set aside as identifying God with the world. The second is refuted by the evidence of design. Nothing is left to chance. The doctrine of final causes is founded on 'universal experience.' The world is evidently the work of an intelligent Creator. It is probable that He would leave some record of His work. This we have in Genesis. The account of the flood is confirmed by many ancient authors. The record of creation was probably made to Adam, and by him handed

down to posterity. It is not to be understood as an allegory but to be taken in its literal sense.¹

Nearly allied to the Burnet Essays were the Bridgewater Treatises. The Earl of Bridgewater bequeathed money for a work to be written by persons appointed by the Royal Society, on 'The Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God as manifested in Creation.' The arguments were to be drawn from the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms, from anatomy, physiology and discoveries, ancient or modern, in arts and sciences. The bequest was for a work by one or more authors. The subject was divided among eight, who each treated it from the standpoint of his own special studies. The result was an abundance of science, with only a meagre amount of theology.

To Dr Chalmers was assigned the manifestation of this 'Power, Wisdom, and Goodness in the Adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man.' This was obviously a difficult task, but the author interpreted his subject not as simply mind over against external nature, that is, not merely the adaptations between mind and matter, but between mind and mind. This resulted in a discourse, metaphysical and ethical. The argument for wise and beneficent contrivance was not drawn from morality in the abstract, but from the constitution of man's moral nature, which 'is a concrete and substantive reality made up of facts that come within the domain of observation.'

Before coming to the argument proper, there is first a consideration of the procedure of natural theology. Through all nature we see the adaptation of means to beneficial ends. The argument increases in strength with the number and complexity of the means. These are seen in the dispositions of matter, as the sun in the centre of our system, in the laws of matter as the law of gravitation. Evidence is of different degrees. The construction of an eye speaks more of God

¹ Forty years later the Burnet Prize Essayists were William Anchor Thompson and John Tulloch, the first Essay is called 'Christian Theism,' and the subject is treated with great fulness, the second is called 'Theism,' and is closely reasoned, taking notice of how teleology is affected by the modern doctrines of typology and morphology.

than the construction of a planetarium. The material universe affords decisive attestations of the natural perfections of the Godhead, but it leaves the moral perfections involved in the profoundest mystery. On these the phenomena of mind cast more light than the phenomena of matter. That the sight of distress should be followed by compassion, is an obvious provision of benevolence. The same may be said of the fact that virtue is felt and recognised by the human mind, and again in the supremacy of conscience. There is a distinct and authoritative voice on the side of righteousness. Virtue is happiness, vice is misery. Virtue is the remedy for all the ills of the world. Truth and honesty make the well-being of man.

The second Treatise was by John Kidd, Doctor of Medicine. His subject was 'The Adaptation of External Nature to the Physical Condition of Man.' He said in the preface that he would only unfold a train of facts to illustrate his thesis, but could not attempt any argument. The reader was left to apply the facts, and the writer hoped he would be convinced.

William Whewell, in the third Treatise, which was on 'Astronomy and General Physics,' wished to reconcile the friends of religion to the progress of the physical sciences. He was to show how admirably every advance in our knowledge of the universe harmonises with the belief of a wise and good God. In many departments of science multitudes of known facts cannot be traced to their ultimate material causes, but in astronomy we have a wonderful example of the degree of such knowledge which may be obtained. If the earth were nearer to the sun, or further from it, there would be a difference in vegetation. Animals are reproduced at the time of the year most suited for the commencement of life. In the length of the day the cosmical and physiological arrangements are adapted to each other. Flowers open so regularly at certain times of the day, that Linnæus proposed to make a floral clock.

Dr William Buckland proved the wisdom and goodness of God from geology. The supposition that the world was only six thousand years old is disproved by the fact that it had been peopled by a long succession of living creatures for countless ages. The first verse of Genesis may refer to an epoch antecedent to the first day, but we have no reason to

expect in the Bible a revelation of science. We cannot say where such a revelation could have stopped without imperfections similar to those which are imputed to the Mosaic narrative. In any past condition of the human race a perfect revelation of science was impossible. The narrative in Genesis does not show in what manner the world was made, but by whom it was made. In the animal and vegetable kingdoms there is apparent confusion and disturbance. Geology shows by what contrivances they are regulated. The globe is adapted to man. The suitability of the soil for agriculture is brought about solely by the irregular arrangement of the earth's crust. There is the same mark of design or adaptation in geological fishes, birds, and other animals which we see in the living creatures that now exist. One plan runs through all. The paddle of the ichthyosaurus and pleiosaurus can be recognised in the hand and fingers with which we now write.

Charles Babbage added of his own accord a ninth Bridge-water Treatise. Whewell had said that with the greatest propriety we might 'deny to mechanical philosophers and mathematicians of recent times any authority with regard to their views of the administration of the Universe.' No help was to be expected from them 'as we ascend to the First Cause, the Ruler of the Universe.' As one of those from whom nothing was to be expected, Babbage made his contribution. He had invented a calculating machine, and by this he illustrated how the machine of the Universe may have been constructed so as to work for an end without the interference of the Maker after the construction. In the complex phenomena of nature the existence of vegetable forms is made possible by the successive adaptations of the earth, then of living things with the faculty of development into higher forms. This view of nature is vindicated from the charge of fatalism. The Creator knew and foresaw the remotest consequences of His laws. Miracles may be not deviations from the laws of matter and mind, but the fulfilment of more extensive laws than those which we suppose to exist. As a natural philosopher, Babbage threw out some fragmentary thoughts on several theological questions. One was the inevitable consequences of all that men say or do. The air is called a

library, on whose pages are written all that man has ever uttered or whispered. In like manner, earth, air, and ocean are eternal witnesses of the acts we have done. As on the brow of the first murderer was stamped the indelible mark of his guilt, so the Almighty has established laws by which every succeeding criminal is chained to the testimony of his crime. We are all conscious how the evil we have done clings to the memory. There are words and actions in the past which torment us even when no living being remembers them but ourselves. The finer our feelings the more our sense of right is developed, the more bitter is the recollection of past errors. In a future life, supposing other conditions the same, this memory of the evil done in the past may be so intensified by an inward finer sense as to be in itself the punishment of wrong doing.¹

Dr Chalmers wrote much on Evidences. His Essay on Christianity² dwelt primarily and mainly on the External Evidences. In the spirit of the inductive philosophy the arguments *à posteriori* were most prominent. Other writers had made natural religion take precedence of Revelation, and had laid down rules by which the Scriptures themselves were to be judged. All this is put aside just as Bacon put aside theories for facts. Christianity is to tell its own tale. We are to look into the truth of the history, know if such a man as Jesus ever appeared, if He wrought the miracles ascribed to Him, and taught the doctrines He is recorded to have taught. We have no knowledge beforehand if the doctrines of Jesus were such as God would reveal. We are ignorant of what God is. Internal evidences may follow in a secondary form, but must be kept altogether distinct from the historical. The contents of the record have no affinity with the history of the record. However impossible may be the matter recorded, the testi-

¹ The other Lectures were on the 'Anatomy of the Hand,' by Sir Charles Bell; 'Animal and Vegetable Physiology,' by Peter Mark Roget; 'Habits and Instincts of Animals,' by William Kirkby; and 'Chemistry and Physiology,' by William Prout. The Bridgewater Treatises did not accumulate argument, but only instances. Each writer was strong in his own department of science. Harriet Martineau said of one of them, he put in just as much theology as he was paid for.

² In the 'Edinburgh Encyclopædia.'

mony is the same. There are two ways by which a message may be tested, one from what we know of the person from whom the message comes, and the likelihood of his sending such a message, the other by the credibility of the messenger. The first is subject to great uncertainty. We may be unable to judge of the message. We are unable to judge of the truth of Christianity merely from its doctrines.

The primary object in dwelling entirely on the External Evidence was to keep it distinct from all other, and to express a strong faith that it was perfectly sufficient in itself. Paley was the great master who had proved Christianity on the principles of Bacon. Friends and reviewers remonstrated with Chalmers that he was setting aside not only internal evidence, but the evidence of natural religion. On the internal evidence the faith of the vast majority of Christians was founded. When the article was republished by itself, a short advertisement intimated that though the object was to show that external testimony was sufficient, the author was far from asserting it to be the only channel to a faith in the truth of Christianity. Other kinds of evidence were admitted to be important, and in a later publication¹ Chalmers spoke of the self-evidencing power of the Bible, than which he said no position could be more strongly or more philosophically sustained. Dr Owen had proved that this evidence is 'superior to the testimony of eye-witnesses or the evidence of miracles, or those supernatural gifts with which the first teachers of Christianity were endowed.'

Dr Chalmers' biographer says, that in 1836 he 'undertook to add to his original volume what might render it a complete treatise on the evidences of Christianity. The part now occupied with the internal equalled that assigned to the external.' Natural theology took its ordinary place as independent of Revelation. The proofs of the Being of God were such as, that the present transitional economy had a beginning which is shown from geological and other evidence from the phenomena of nature and the constitution of the human mind. The apparent cause of intelligent beings must be itself intelligent. He that formed the eye shall He not see,

and He that teacheth man knowledge shall He not know?

On external evidence the great question was miracles. Hume's argument must be answered—that the miracles are more likely to be false than the testimony true. Both Englishmen and Scotchmen had written against Hume. The latter reasoned about reasoning, while the former assumed the validity of reason, and went straight to the argument. Campbell had taken the position that belief in testimony did not depend on experience, but is an intuitive and original principle. Chalmers founds belief in testimony on experience, and finds Hume's mistake to be that he did not distinguish between a testimony which was honest and one which was suspicious. There may be cases in which a miracle is not improbable, and testimony may be conclusive. Whately had said that it was absurd merely to consider the average chances for the truth of testimony in the abstract, without inquiring what the testimony is in the instance before us. We have the testimony of credible witnesses to credible facts. In the last of his thoughts on evidences, Chalmers clung to the idea that the Bible, being proved to be from God, must not be judged by man. We may sit in judgment on the credentials of heaven's ambassadors, but we have no right to sit in judgment on the Revelation given.

CHAPTER VI

CHURCH AND STATE

THE question of the connection between Church and State had often been discussed both by theologians and politicians, but never so fully and ardently as in the early part of the present century. The subject has a theoretical side, also a practical, and both the theory and the practice are capable of endless varieties. There are scarcely two countries in which the connection is the same, nor even two centuries in any one country. There may be, as sometimes in the middle ages, control of the State by the Church, or as in the East and in some Reformed Churches in the West, control of the Church by the State, and this again may be in an infinity of degrees. In old countries where there has been collision between Church and State, there may be an agreement for the independence of each, or in new countries where there are many sects, and no single Church with great influence, there may be entire independence. The question how a State Church originates is much the same in kind as that of the origin of government. There has been a growth, though how and when, it is often hard to say. The most obvious explanation of the origin is in the necessity for every State having control over the property of corporate bodies. To this extent, and in this sense, every sect with endowed property is an established Church. But the richer and stronger a Church is, the greater is the necessity for State control. This is a simple fact manifested in history. The primary connection then between Church and State is one of property.

But the question has other bearings. Hooker regarded the Church and State as one and the same community under two different aspects. This was a theory which fitted the actual condition of the Church of England in the time of Queen Elizabeth. All foreign influence was excluded. The Christian people of England were one Church and one State. They were one in the face of opposition from without and schism from within. In the last century, Warburton wrote of an alliance as if there had been a time when Church and State made an agreement. But this has no foundation in history. The Church and State grew into each other by the mutual necessities of both, and in the circumstances for their mutual advantage. Paley, recognising simply the fact of the connection, spoke of the benefits accruing from it. It was no part of Christianity. A Church might exist with or without State connection, but this alliance was beneficial to both. The Reformation in England resulted in a closer connection of Church and State than had been before, and in a greater supremacy of the State over the Church. This began with the submission of the clergy under Archbishop Warham, and ended with the Royal Supremacy as established under Elizabeth. The civil ruler took the place of the Pope, and the Church was governed by King and Parliament, that is, as Hooker said, the lay governor or the lay synod.

The opposition to the Church and State connection arose from two different quarters. There was a growing party both in the Church of England and in the Church of Scotland which demanded more freedom for the Church. There were also Nonconformists, who originally had no objections to the principle of a State Church, but who rather, some of them at least, held it to be the duty of the State to support what was orthodox, but who now thought that they suffered a disadvantage from the existence of a State Church from which they dissented. The growing desire in the Church of England for independence of the State was set forth in a pamphlet called 'Letters on the Church,' by an Episcopalian,¹ which sets forth the modern Anglican idea of ecclesiastical independence.² This publication was ascribed to Whately, and

¹ 1826.

² As Whately never disowned these 'Letters,' it is inferred by

it is generally believed that he had something to do with it, if he did not actually write it. The argument was that the connection involved evil, both spiritual and temporal. To receive the aid of the civil power was injurious to the purity of religion, as it involved the interference of the State with the government of the Church. It was also injurious to the State, as it created dissatisfaction among those who dissented from the National Church. The plea for disestablishment was that the Church might be free to manage its own affairs. As the clergy do not receive their emoluments from the State, but from the old ecclesiastical endowments, they ought not to be treated as the servants of the State.

It is remarkable that at the same time the demand for ecclesiastical independence was advancing with equal pace in the Church of England and in the Church of Scotland, and the same men in Scotland who were the advocates of greater ecclesiastical independence were also the defenders of the Church and State connection. The leader of the Church of Scotland, Dr Thomas Chalmers, created a great controversy by advocating direct aid from the State for Church extension. His principle was utilitarian. He argued that if the people were more religious the State would be the gainer, for moral and political improvement would be sure to follow. It was therefore the duty of the State to build and to endow Churches.

An Established Church was defined as a Church that receives legal provision from the State, or has secured to it the endowments made in past times. Neither of these need involve any interference with the Church's independence. For illustration, an Indian planter might pay a Moravian missionary to teach his slaves and yet leave the missionary free. The corruptions of the Church had by some been traced to its establishment by Constantine, but it was shown that the Church had immense wealth, and that corruption had begun long before Constantine was Emperor. Moreover,

Newman, Dean Church, and others that he was the author of them. On the other hand, his biographer assumes that as he never acknowledged them he did not write them. See *Life by his daughter*, vol. i, p. 52. They are unlike anything which Whately ever wrote or was known to hold.

there is no evidence that Constantine added anything to the endowments of the Church. One benefit of an established Church was that it repressed the supremacy of the priesthood. In Scotland the principle was laid down by Knox at the Reformation that there should be a settled provision for the teachers of Christianity. The old parochial system was not destroyed, and to strengthen it in the present day is the path of true reform. In theory the State might establish any form of Evangelical religion, but practically and as the issue of the advocacy of Establishments, help was asked for the extension of the existing Church of Scotland.

The demand for State extension of the Church was founded on the assumption that what was called the voluntary principle was not sufficient to meet the religious requirements of the people. The principle of supply and demand applicable in other things was not applicable in religion. There was no demand for Christian instruction corresponding to the demand for the ordinary necessities of life. The upper classes might have religion on the principle of supply and demand, but the poor would be neglected. The aphorism of Burke was endorsed, that 'the State support of religion was the chief defence of the commonwealth.' The objection that one religious community was aided to the disparagement of another was answered by the consideration that the question was not one of justice between sect and sect, but of justice to the whole population.

Dr Chalmers was answered by Dr Wardlaw, who may be taken as representing those who were aggrieved by the existence of a State Church. The support of religion, he maintained, should be left entirely to the liberality of Christians. When a legal provision is made by the State, there is a bargain by which the Church ceases to be free. Instead of giving more endowments, the State should take away what had been already given. The advocates of a State Church went to the Old Testament for precedents, but they did not venture to appeal to the New, for in it there could be found no precedents for State interference with religion. Chalmers had drawn a beautiful picture of the Parish—the hallowed church, the peaceful parsonage, the holy acre of God, where rest the dead, the church bells on the Sabbath morn calling friends and

neighbours to worship together and bend as one household before a common Father. It was difficult, Wardlaw said, to refute a picture so charmingly painted. The only answer was, that it had never been real, and if it had, it was not in the Bible.

In 1838 William Ewart Gladstone, representing the advanced Anglican position, wrote 'The State in its Relation to the Church.' In a later edition he criticised Chalmers and Wardlaw and other writers on the subject.¹ The Episcopal Church he regarded as the visible Catholic Church in England, and therefore it alone should be supported by the State. Those who wished separation wished to strip government of all its highest duties. If the body politic studies its own interests and wishes to perform its proper functions, it will seek to co-operate with the Church of Christ. In reviewing the different theories of the Church and State connection, Gladstone thought that Hooker sometimes lost sight of the distinction between a society and the sum-total of the individuals who may belong to it. The people of England, for instance, did not compose one society which bore two different names, but two societies accidentally co-extensive with the societies which they composed. Warburton made the 'alliance' a matter of calculation. He did not speak of the State as having a conscience and bound to serve the truth. Paley too was for mere utility, while his view of the Church, the Creeds, and the different forms of Christianity were full of the seeds of evil. Coleridge had rightly argued for a 'clerisy,' but in calling the clergy 'the trustees of a reserved national fund,' he had misunderstood the nature of ecclesiastical property. What the nation had given to the Church was no longer the nation's property, in the ordinary sense, much less was that which was given by individuals. Chalmers' theory of the union of the State with Evangelical Protestantism, a thing impossible to define, was impracticable. It gave the government no universal criterion by which it might be guided.

The duty of the State in respect of religion was found in the Scriptures in the nature of a State, in the results to be obtained, and in the universal practice of nations. Of these, the second claimed the highest consideration. The State has

¹ Ed. 4. 1841.

a moral personality like an individual. The legislative mind must be ethically instructed, and religion is the only basis on which moral science can be effectually reared. The one Catholic Church is the only Religious Society with which the State can form an alliance. It is a definite divine institution, and so the State has something palpable with which to deal.

Baptist Wriothlesley Noel, a clergyman of the Evangelical party, seceded from the Church of England because it was governed by the State. He wrote an 'Essay,' in which he argued that the State had taken the episcopate or oversight of the Church, an office for which it had no qualifications. It was not a body of Christian men, and even if it had been, it would have been its duty to let the Church govern itself. The State had been described as holding the relation of a parent to children, or as being higher in the scale of intelligence than the 'fluctuating elements of public opinion,'¹ but so far from this being true, the State was really incapable of giving instruction. The Union of Church and State was prejudicial to free inquiry, and condemned by the testimony of history. The corruptions of the Church are traced in the usual fashion to Constantine, who himself was a doubtful Christian, and in his son's time 'the world groaned to find itself Arian.' Even the Papal persecutions and the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff were due to the union of Church and State. The Church of England first sold its freedom when it accepted the legal provision which was made by the laws of Offa. The bishops are now appointed by the State, and many of the clergy by these State-appointed bishops. The Church of itself can do nothing, even for the removal of spiritual destitution.

The different possibilities of different kinds of State connections may be seen in the respective histories of the Churches of England and of Scotland. In the former, the circumstances of the Reformation demanded the supremacy of the civil ruler. As a matter of fact, the freedom since the Reformation has not been great. Convocation could only discuss, it could never legislate. In Scotland the Church courts are supreme. Their laws are valid within their own province. It is only when they encroach on the civil that the

¹ Gladstone.

State interferes. State control is little more than a name. It is represented in the General Assembly by the High Commissioner, who says nothing and does less. He in no wise interferes with the action of the Church.

The only deprivation of freedom of which the Church of Scotland had to complain was in the exercise of patronage. By the Union settlement the right of presentation was vested in the people. In 1712, by Act of Parliament, it was transferred to the patrons. This was long endured, though under protest. The democratic spirit which produced the Reform Bill and stirred the stagnant waters of Church matters in England affected the advanced party in the Church of Scotland. In 1830, an act was passed in the General Assembly, on the motion of Dr Chalmers, that no minister be presented to any parish against the will of the people. In the following year another act was passed, claiming the right of veto on the nomination of any patron. Here Church and State were sure to come into collision as soon as there was a case in which the patron chose to resist the exercise of the veto. Four years later this happened. The patron had the victory in the civil courts. Other cases followed. The Church courts refused to submit to the decisions in favour of the patrons. The moderate party wished to submit on the ground that the Church had no authority to act contrary to the law of the land. Their leader, Dr Cook, argued that there could not be two independent legislatures in one country. Society could not exist if the law of the land was not supreme. A Church, even an Established Church, is bound to exercise authority, but every subject of dispute between the spiritual and the civil is not spiritual but civil. The party which contended for 'ecclesiastical independence' appealed, they said, to higher laws than the civil. They sacrificed their position in the Church to obey what they regarded as the law of God rather than the law of man. The result of this action is, that the Church of Scotland is now independent of even the limitation of its liberties which once existed in the exercise of patronage, and such is the irony of events, that the Free Church, led by Dr Chalmers, flourishes on the voluntary principle which he once despised.

CHAPTER VII

PROPHECY

WITH some English theologians prophecy has always been a favourite study. It was a subject of jest for Voltaire that the discoverer of the law of gravitation should have written a commentary on the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the wisdom of Calvin has been commended that he abstained from any interpretation of the visions of St John. The study of prophecy in England received a fresh impulse by the events of the French Revolution. The series of rapid changes in government and society, and the convulsions that affected all European nations, seemed a clear unfolding of the drama of the world's history as seen by Daniel and the seer of Patmos. The interpretations were often ingenious, sometimes amusing, and are now mainly valuable as lessons of warning to future interpreters. Even sober writers found in the prophetic books what neither God nor the prophets intended to be in them, and they were so certain of the train of events which were in progress, that they themselves became prophets, even fixing the dates of the things which were shortly to come to pass.

If the subject were not too serious, it might be amusing to dwell on the vagaries of interpreters of prophecy. The orthodox Protestant generally found the little horn, the man of sin, the Antichrist and the Apocalyptic harlot to be the Church of Rome. Sometimes they represented the persecuting powers, Pagan, Papal and Mohammedan. That the Pope was Antichrist, if we can rely on the references made by prophetic

writers, was believed by some before the Reformation. Gregory the Great said that he who assumed the title of universal Bishop would be the Antichrist. This was done by his successor Boniface III. The Bishop of Orleans, at the Council of Rheims, in the tenth century asked if the Pope were not the Antichrist sitting in the temple of God as God. St Bernard called the Pope the Antichrist, the little horn, the first beast. The cave in the abyss which the angel opened was found by some writers to be the rise of Mohammedanism, as the Koran originated in a cave. The second beast was Jacobinism, or the infidel power under the name of Reason. Under this power men were to cease to believe the Mosaic record of the creation.¹

In 1807 John Martin Butt illuminated the past, the present, and the future. In the Revelation of St John, he found the flight of James II and the advent of the Prince of Orange. The Church of Philadelphia was the Church of England, whose prosperity is seen in the erection of St Paul's Cathedral, the foundation of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the victories of the Duke of Marlborough.

Edward Evanson, who left the Church of England and became a Unitarian, thought the Unitarians were the two witnesses or the small number of rational Christians.² About the year 1803 two writers simultaneously discovered, though by different methods, that Napoleon was the beast of the Apocalypse. The method of the one was to add together all the Emperors from the time of Julius Cæsar, and add to the number that of all the Popes from Linus to Pius VII. The sum total was 665, which left for Napoleon the number 666. The other writer made 666 out of the name Buonaparte by a little variation in the spelling.³

The likeness of Napoleon to the Apocalyptic beast almost deprived the Pope of his long established reputation as the great Antichrist. In 1814 James Hatley Frere sent to the press 'A Comparative View of Prophecy.' He said in that

¹ See Henry Kett, 'History the Interpreter of Prophecy.'

² Reflections on the State of Religion.

³ See the 'Prophetic Mirror' by L. Mayer 1803, England's Triumph over Buonaparte and his Armada, foretold 1700 years ago, 1804, see also 'Monthly Review,' vol. xliii, p. 321.

book Napoleon would leave France for Italy, and before the book was published, which was in 1815, what was only an interpretation of prophecy had become an accomplished fact. The great image of Daniel related to the history of the world, and the vision of the four beasts to the history of the Church. Corresponding to this, the sealed book of St John was the secular history of the Roman Empire, and the open book the history of the Church. The seven seals are the history of the Western Empire, and the trumpets of the Eastern. The little opened book is a complete history of the Church. The little horn having eyes is the Papacy, which made war with the saints for 1200 years. The destruction of the Papacy commenced in 1792.

Many things set forth in Daniel happened long ago, but the chief events of which he spoke belonged to the present time, and were of such transcendent importance as to be the subject of prophecy in the ages long past. Everything led up to Napoleon. He is the infidel power that was to arise in the last days. Louis XVI is thus described in Daniel xi, 20 'There shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of his kingdom, but within a few days he shall be destroyed neither in anger nor in battle.' By his oppressive taxation he raised strong opposition, and was basely murdered by his traitorous subjects. The verses following speak of Napoleon as 'a vile person,' who shall stand up, but 'to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.' That Napoleon was 'vile' is proved by his being the son of a lawyer in Corsica. Prophecy has no double meaning, and Napoleon alone was in the mind of Daniel as the chief person in the fourth or Roman Empire, which was the great enemy of the Church. After his league with the Pope he worked deceitfully. He was against the Holy Covenant, that is, Great Britain. But the ships of Chittim, that is the British navy, shall come against him. It shall 'do great exploits,' which was fulfilled in the victories of Nelson.

The stone cut out of the mountain began to smite the Western Empire in 1792. Since that time the nations of Europe have been breaking in pieces. This is shown in the seven trumpets and the seven vials. The reign of Christ

may be said to have commenced. The 1260 years of Papal prosperity came to an end in 1790. In another thirty years, 1822, is the destruction of the Roman Empire. Then comes the end of both Papal and infidel powers, and the Jews return to their own land. In forty years more the Mohammedan superstition will be destroyed, heathen nations converted, and blessed is he who shall live to see the year 1867.

Edward Cooper, in 1825, showed that Napoleon was 'the wilful king' of Daniel. He arose after the 1260 years, the time of Daniel's little horn and John's horned beast, or the Papal dominion. The judgment was then to sit on the horn, and the beast to go into captivity. Napoleon did 'great exploits.' He seized 'the gold and silver and pleasant things.' He 'divided the land for gain' among his generals. He was to prosper 'till the judgment be accomplished.' The war in the Peninsula led to his ruin. The king of the South pushed at him and the king of the North, that is England, came against him like 'a whirlwind with chariots and horsemen and with many ships.' The prediction as to his end was that 'none should help him.' Some thought he would escape from St Helena, but he was left without help.

Bishop Horsley was also among the prophets. He urged the necessity of attending to prophetic dates. The greater part of 'the time of the end' he believed to be already past, and we were those on whom 'the ends of the world had come.' By an abstruse algebraical calculation, beyond the reach of ordinary people, he proved that the 1260 days of the power and activity of the beast began in 1726 and would end in 1968. In 1726 'the Atheistic philosophy began to raise its accursed head in France,' and in 1978 the two witnesses are to be slain, and they will rise again on the eighth of September in the same year, and strike with dismay the adherents of the beast. The little horn or he-goat of Daniel is the persecuting power of the East, which will be manifest about the year 1894, when the Eastern Church will be purged of its insincere members and be reduced to a small afflicted community.¹

* As the century advanced, and long after Napoleon had disappeared from the scene, elaborate expositions of prophecies,

¹ This paper is called 'Of the Prophetic Periods' and was sent by Horsley's son to the British Magazine in 1833.

showing their fulfilment in the present time continued to be written. One of the most popular was the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*.¹ The Apocalypse was assumed to be a symbolical embodiment of history to the end of time, embracing all great events, both in the Church and in the world. The chief parts are indicated by the seven trumpets and the seven vials. The first six seals are referred to the temporary glory, the decline and fall of Pagan Rome before the power of Christianity. The first six trumpets refer to the ravages and destruction of Christian Rome after its apostasy and the division of the Church into East and West. The Reformation falls in about the middle of the sixth trumpet. This is followed by the destruction of the Papacy, the final judgment and the reign of the saints.

The sealed ones were those who held by the doctrines of grace and election as taught by St Augustine. A third part of the Eastern Church was destroyed by the religion of the false prophet. The Western showed religious zeal in the building of cathedrals, but it repented not of its fornications, its thefts, its murders and blasphemies. The woman clothed with the sun brought forth a manchild, that is, faithful children, such as William Wilberforce and the Evangelical clergy. Then out of the mouth of the beast proceeded unclean frogs, Infidelity, Popery, Tractarianism. But the vials were poured out on the beast and his image, that is, the Church of Rome and Napoleon.

In 1849-53 Elliot was Warburtonian Lecturer. By Warburton's will the Lecturer was 'to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of prophecies in the Old and New Testaments,' that is, of those 'which relate to the Christian Church,' and those 'which relate to the apostasy of Papal Rome.' Beginning with the prophecy of Isaiah in chapter xlii, the Lecturer showed how the Christian Church had come from the Gentiles, from the isles as the prophet had more specifically intimated, that is, the isles of the Mediterranean. The philosophers of Greece had tried for seven hundred years to give

¹ By E. B. Elliot, late Vicar of Tuxford and Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge.

light to the Gentiles, but it was only given by Jehovah Himself in the revelation of His Son.

But the Christian Church had scarcely been founded when the mystery of iniquity began to work. St Paul spoke of the Man of Sin, St John of the Antichrist, and to this corresponded many things in Daniel and the Apocalypse. The fulfilment was gradual. By the end of the third century there was a tendency to find an analogy between the Jewish and the Christian Ecclesiastical system. The Presbyters were called priests and had a sacrificial or mediatorial character like the priests, under the old law. In the fourth century the externals of Pagan worship were introduced into the Christian Church, incense, candles, pictures, images and offerings suspended on the idols, the same kind of worship which the old Romans had used in the service of their gods.

Then came the time when that 'which letteth' was taken away. The Goths conquered the Roman Empire, and now the Man of Sin began his reign. The Antichrist took the place of Christ. He took the title of Christ's Vicar or Vicerent, and set himself in the temple of God as God. About the same time the Pope claimed, as the successor of St Peter, to govern the universal Church. This great power was the little horn of Daniel and the wilful king. He was also the beast out of the abyss, the harlot, the dragon—the persecutor of the saints. His reign began about six hundred and six, and as it is to continue for twelve hundred and sixty years it will come to an end about eighteen hundred and sixty six.

Many earnest men among the Evangelical clergy in the third and fourth decades of the century were students of prophecy, as Bickersteth, M'Neile, Noel, and looked for the advent of Christ as near at hand. The devout spirit in which prophecy was studied, and the lesson inculcated of being always ready made the practical aspect of the study take precedence of the theoretical. 'In Evangelical circles,' said Conybeare in his famous article 'Novels and fairy-tales are forbidden luxuries, but their place is abundantly supplied by the romantic fictions daily issued from the prophetic press.'¹ In recent times the interpreters of

¹ Edin. Rev. 1853.

prophecy have largely disappeared. Even Warburtonian Lecturers, especially if they are High Churchmen, do not regard the Papal Church as Antichrist. This is required by their position, for, alas for Anglican Orders if they are conferred by the Scarlet Lady or have come through the Man of Sin.

CHAPTER VIII

NONCONFORMISTS, ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT

THE definiteness of dogma in the Roman Catholic community might seem to leave but little ground for diversity of religious thought. Progress or development is of the nature of heresy, unless it be such a development as finds the official sanction of the Church, then it is Catholic doctrine. But man is an intellectual being, and he will think and reason even when under restraint. Hence we find heresies and heretics in the Church of Rome, though it may be sometimes barely tolerated or marked with a note of censure. In the first year of the century died one whom Roman Catholics do not care to recognise, but who to the end of his life clung to the Roman Communion. Alexander Geddes¹ was born in the far north of Scotland. He was the child of humble parents whose ancestors remained Roman Catholics after the Reformation. In his father's house was an English Bible, the study of which was the delight of his youth. It inspired him with the idea which ruled his life, to give to his co-religionists a good and correct version of the Scriptures in the English tongue. He was not satisfied with the Protestant version and still less with that of Douay which he said had been made by men 'whose tempers were soured by controversy and whose vernacular language had been corrupted by residence in a foreign land.' This version was 'a barbarous translation from the Vulgate before its last revision and accompanied with acrimonious and injurious annotations.'

¹ B. 1737, d. 1801.

We need not say that Geddes interpreted all Roman Catholic dogmas in the mild and half Protestant form which they have taken in the hands of some other divines of the same communion. His biographer¹ says that he took the sacred Scriptures alone as his standard of faith and exhorted every member of his congregation to do the same, to study for himself, to interpret for himself and to submit to no foreign control except in matters fairly decided by the Catholic Church at large in General Councils. 'He would ridicule the infallibility of the Pope and laugh at images, rosaries, scapulars, Agnus Deis, blessed medals, indulgences, obits and dirges as much as the most inveterate Protestant in the neighbourhood.'

In 1800, Geddes published 'A Modest Apology' for those of the Roman Catholic Religion. It took the form of a vindication of their civil rights. He insisted strongly on retaining the distinction between Catholics and Papists. The former were innocent and inoffensive persons, but the latter were violent. They made unreasonable attacks on Protestants and pertinaciously maintained points of doctrine and discipline, which were certainly not Catholic. The indiscretions and violence of the Papists should not be charged on the whole body of Catholics. In this demand there was probably an allusion to the controversy raised by Dr Milner's History of Winchester. Dr Sturges, who answered Milner on the very title of his book, called all the Roman Catholics of Britain by the name of Papists. Again it is not right to make Roman Catholics of the present day responsible for the sins of their forefathers. The 'enormous excesses' of the Roman Catholic Church in other ages, and in other countries, should not be laid to the charge of the English Catholics of our time. Nor should they be held responsible for 'the fabrication of false decretals, the rage for idle pilgrimages, the vile traffic in indulgences, the propagation of lying legends, feigned miracles, and apocryphal revelations, and the Pope's infallibility.' These are merely the 'tares and the cockle,' that have grown up while men slept. They have been denounced by the Bernards and the Gersons of the Catholic Church as much as by any Protestants. Nor is it right to charge Catholics with

¹ Mason Good.

inferences made from their beliefs. Just as it would not be fair to say that the Church of England denies the Headship of Christ, because it acknowledges the civil ruler to be supreme in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil, so is it unfair for Protestants to charge their inferences on doctrines held by Catholics. Protestant representations of Catholic doctrines are often calumny or caricature, but even if they were as bad as Protestants say they are, this would be no just plea for withholding civil rights.

The 'Articles of Religion,' so far as their teaching is positive, teach substantially what Roman Catholics believe. There is no such break between the Church of England and the Church of Rome in their *credenda* as is commonly supposed. Some theologians, especially those of the Sorbonne have confessed that every fundamental article of faith is found either explicitly or implicitly in the written Word, and some Protestant theologians have been willing to grant that every article of faith is not so clearly and expressly revealed in the written Word as not to stand in need of apostolical tradition and a secondary support.

The supremacy of the Pope was first introduced into the definition of the Church¹ by the Jesuit Canisius. Before that it was simply 'the congregation of the saints.' The idea of Papal infallibility is 'scouted by every Roman Catholic of the present age.' As to councils it is doubtful if there ever was one strictly œcumenical. Certainly no Roman Catholic of the present day would ascribe infallibility to the second of Nice, to that of Florence or Constance. The canon of Vincentius of Lerins would set aside all the creeds, for they each contain something not 'believed always, everywhere, and by all.'

The Pope's supremacy properly understood is not inimical to civil government. Whenever and wherever it has been so, it has been in virtue of an unlawful assumption of authority. The Pope has no primacy by divine right. No such primacy was given even to St Peter. It came to the bishops of Rome simply because their see was the capital of the empire, just as the Bishop of Constantinople got the second place as Bishop of New Rome.

¹ In 1567.

In this way the doctrines of the Church of Rome most offensive to Protestants are modified, and Protestant prejudices are found to be caused by misapprehensions of Catholic doctrine. Such is the common belief that no faith is to be kept with heretics. Some Popes have taught this, but that does not make it a doctrine of the Catholic Church. Transubstantiation is taught in the Church of Rome, and the Councils of Lateran and Trent have even defined the mode in which the change is effected, but it would have been better to have left the words of Christ and His apostles without further explanation. The Council of Ephesus ought not to have proclaimed 'the blasphemous absurdity,' that Mary was the mother of God. The Mass is merely the Lord's Supper celebrated in Latin with some pomp and pageantry borrowed from the Pagans. There may be no such thing as works of supererogation, but if there be, it is very good of those who have any works to spare, to give them to their neighbours. The sum of the argument is that the Church of Rome in itself is not irrational, Protestants only object to abuses and extreme statements.

We turn now to the Bible which was to be the author's great gift to the British Roman Catholic. He first issued a prospectus in which he spoke of the text. The Jews had made the Massora an authority for interpretation. Every word and letter in the Scripture was supposed to be incorrupt. The Christians learned Hebrew from the Jews and took all they said for gospel. The idea of verbal infallibility was specially suited to Protestants who made Scripture their rule of faith. Romanists have always had a sounder judgment than Protestants of the state of the Hebrew text. It may have been from the deference paid to the Vulgate, but this is not certain. The Council of Trent did not, as is generally supposed, declare the Vulgate the only authentic version. It merely said that it was faithful and authentic. Many critics of the present day believe the Hebrew text was on purpose corrupted by the Jews. This was also believed by some of the old Fathers, but the Jews were exculpated by Jerome and Augustine. The errors in the Hebrew text are more likely to be due to accident or ignorance than to design.

So much for the text. In the preface we are told that

Genesis I, teaches that the world was created out of unformed matter, previously existing. The Pentateuch in its present form is not the work of Moses. It bears marks of having been written in Canaan, probably in Jerusalem and not before the reign of David, nor after Hezekiah. The evidence seems to point to the reign of Solomon, though this also is too early unless we admit posterior interpolations. A doubt is expressed about the double authorship on the Elohist and Jehovistic theory, but the writer modestly intimates that he is not so self-sufficient as to believe that he may not be wrong.

In the Preface to vol. ii, it is said that the author of the Book of Judges, whoever he was, gives an odd reason for the Canaanites not being driven out of the land. They were left to prove the Israelites, though God had enjoined their utter destruction. This may have been cruel and sanguinary yet it might have had political wisdom on its side, while the reason given for their remaining is contrary to divine wisdom and veracity. But it is doubtful if either God or Moses ever commanded the destruction of the Canaanites. It is surprising that a man like Bishop Watson should ever have tried to justify this destruction. The command may have been a fabrication of some posterior Jew, who wished to justify the cruelties of his nation. As to the inspiration of the Bible, it is asked on what principle we are to suppose that for a thousand years Jewish histories were written by inspiration and not Gentile histories? Why should the children of the bondwoman be more favoured than the children of the free woman? For such a question the writer knew that 'Protestant and Papist would vie with each other to throw the first stone' at him. But the Jewish histories lay no claim to inspiration. They appeal like other histories to public documents for the facts which they record. Philo calls the writers 'Hierophants and Enthusiasts,' but these words do not imply inspiration in the modern sense. The advantages of this view of partial inspiration are that it meets the objections of the Deists, and it gets rid of 'a cumbersome load of commentators and an endless tribe of harmonists,' who only puzzle what they profess to explain. It also gets rid of an 'incredible number of prodigies' and 'interferences of the Deity which need not be taken literally.'

The gains which we are to have from the criticism of the Old Testament are these: 'The Hebrew Scriptures will be more read and the good things they contain more fairly estimated.' When 'seen as they are and taken for what they profess to be' their true value would be better appreciated. The writer says 'The Hebrew Scriptures I have examined and appreciated as I would any other writings of antiquity.' He repudiates the imputation of not being a believer, for he believes as much as he has sufficient ground for believing, which is the only rational belief. The 'vulgar Papist' supposes his Church infallible, though he knows not where its infallibility is to be found, and the 'vulgar Protestant' believes in the infallibility of the Bible just because he was taught to believe it. Geddes said in conclusion, he clung to the Gospel of Jesus and not to metaphysical creeds, Christian is his name and Catholic is his surname, and for these glorious titles he is willing to shed his blood.

But he was treated as a heretic. His translation of the Bible was disowned by the authorities of the Church. He died under ecclesiastical censure receiving the last Sacrament from a French priest, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, when the Vicar Apostolic of the London District forbade him the benefit of all the offices of the Church. It was also forbidden that any Mass should be said for the repose of his soul.

The best known English Roman Catholic writer in the early part of the century was John Lingard,¹ who wrote much in the way of controversy in defence of the Roman Catholic religion. Bishop Barrington in his charge of 1806 called Roman Catholics idolaters. Their use of images in worship, however it might be refined and explained, resulted practically in idolatry. The distinction made by theologians between images as aids to worship and as objects of worship was obliterated in the minds of ordinary people. This error was encouraged by the suppression of the second commandment. It was of a piece with the superstition of the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, of prayers to the Virgin, to angels and saints. The imposition of penances and the purchase of pardons as remedies for past sins were a denial of the efficacy of the great sacrifice of

¹ B. 1771, d. 1851.

Christ for all sin. The denial of the Cup to the laity was a mutilation of the sacrament and a violation of Christ's command—'Drink ye all of this.' Roman Catholics substituted external and ritual performances for the promise of the Holy Ghost. They trusted to the merit of good works, worshipped in an unknown tongue, and kept the Scriptures concealed in a language not understood by the people.

Lingard wrote 'Remarks' on the Bishop's charge. Of the worship of images and the effect of it on Roman Catholics he believed he knew more than the Bishop did, and he had never met any one so ignorant as to pay adoration to either images or pictures. He quoted the Catechism which says, 'This Commandment,' that is, the second, 'forbids the making of images so as to adore them,' that is, it forbids making them as gods. The Church of Rome did not suppress the second commandment. It was found in Catholic Bibles, Catechisms, and Prayer Books. The division of the commandments was not the same as in Protestant Bibles but that was a thing indifferent. Prayers to the saints were simply to ask their intercession, not to answer our prayers. They were like St Paul's request to the Romans, Ephesians, and Corinthians—to pray for him. The saints are asked neither for grace, nor salvation, but simply for friendly intercession. In the collect for St Michael and all Angels in the English Prayer Book, there is a petition that 'the holy angels may by God's appointment, succour and defend us on earth.' So by the Bishop's mode of reasoning, it might be inferred that we are to trust to the angels instead of God's providence.

Lingard denied that the Church of Rome knew anything of 'purchases of pardons.' It never teaches that works of penance are of themselves a compensation for sin. St Paul kept his body in subjection, that was penance. The English Prayer Book inculcates penance, but this is not supposed to be in any way derogatory of Christ's sufferings. The denial of the Cup was no violation of Christ's command but a mere matter of discipline regulated by time and circumstances. The command 'Drink ye all of this' was addressed to the twelve and not to all Christians. The practice of the Church is sufficient evidence of this. St Paul¹ to the

¹ 1 Cor. xi, 27.

Corinthians says 'whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup,' where the English version has changed *or* into *and*. The Catholic does not mutilate the sacrament by denying the Cup, but the Protestant mutilates it by denying the presence of the body and the blood of Christ.

On the subject of ritual observances the charge was too vague to admit of refutation. It is of the nature of religion to require ritual ceremonies. It was added that Protestants did not rest in outward observances. The desertion of the churches testified that if the people worshipped at all, it was worship in spirit and in solitude. The service being in Latin simply meant that the Church of England being modern had a modern language, while the Church of Rome being an ancient Church had an old language. It was so with all old Churches, and to change the language would really be to change the religion. The Church of Rome had not concealed the Scriptures. At the Reformation the art of printing was in its infancy. The Complutensian, Antwerpian and Parisian Polyglots which were prior to the English are evidence that the Church of Rome is no enemy to biblical learning. Gibbon has said that 'a single Benedictine monastery has produced more valuable works than both our Universities.'

The Bishop was defended by 'A Clergyman of the Diocese.'¹ Thomas Le Mesurier, and George Stanley Faber. The first argued from the fact of idolatry in Roman Catholic countries, and the frequent omission of the second commandment, the Cup denied to the laity, and the supremacy ascribed to the Vulgate over other versions of Scripture. Le Mesurier said that the Church of Rome professes to have power to absolve the greatest sinners, that it grants indulgences prospectively for sins in the future, and he quoted the tariffs from the tax book of the Roman Chancery. He said also that the infidelity of France was due to Roman Catholicism. Faber reviewed the chief questions at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Lingard continued his defence. Even if it could be shown that some Catholics had used images in an idolatrous manner the Catholic Church is not responsible. The second commandment was found in twenty Roman Catholic books where it

¹ Phillpotts.

was omitted in one. The wine in the Eucharist was no necessary part of the sacrament. The Scriptures which are the only authority for Protestants, do not even say that it was wine which Jesus told His disciples to drink. That the Church of Rome used the Vulgate to the disparagement of the original Scriptures is a common mistake among Protestants. The Council of Trent simply said that it had authority, not the sole authority, nor is it held to be faultless. As to France there is more religion among the common people than among the same class in England. There the churches are crowded; here they are almost empty. The Church does not profess any power to forgive sins except where there is true penitence and purpose of amendment. There is no such thing as a prospective indulgence and the taxes of the Roman Chancery are merely fees for the expedition of business. As to Faber, prophecy and not argument was his peculiar department. In his progress through this region of mist and darkness he had outstripped the speed of all his competitors. By his profound acquaintance with the helioarkite mythology of the Cabiri and the hieroglyphic language of the Apocalypse, he had already explained to the world the mysteries of 'the time past, the time present, and the time to come.'

'The Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham' was informed that the Church's infallibility was 'in the Episcopal College united to the Pope.' For the use of images in worship we have the case of Joshua falling on his face to the ground before the ark, Moses taking off his shoes on Mount Horeb, and the Israelites falling down before the footstool of God, that is before the ark, for it was holy. The Church of Rome does not accept the Second Council of Nice, neither its acts nor canons, but only a decree passed at its last session. It is not responsible for the ridiculous stories about the virtue of images told at the Council. It had been shown that the schoolmen gave Latria to the cross, to which the answer was that they understood Latria not as the Church has done since. It was not with them the highest worship. Bellarmine condemned the language of the schoolmen not because it meant wrong but because it was liable to be misunderstood.

A second edition of Bishop Barrington's Charge¹ prolonged the controversy. On the Sacrament of the Supper, the Bishop said that the words 'This is my body' are not to be taken literally. Though admitting that the discourse in John vi, referred to the Sacrament, he explained the eating and drinking as spiritual, an act of the mind or an appropriation of spiritual benefits. When Jesus said 'This is my body *broken*' He could not have meant His literal body which was not yet broken. Lingard answered that the Bishop's doctrine of a spiritual and not a literal presence was the doctrine of Zwingle, who had learned it from the devil in a vision. The idea of a spiritual feeding on a body which was not present, was a contradiction in itself. Such a spiritual presence was a real absence.

The controversy ended as is usual with this kind of controversy. Dr Lingard begged of the Protestants to learn Catholic teaching from Catholic theologians and not from Protestant Controversialists, and the Protestants complained that Dr Lingard had modified or explained away some of the more offensive features of the doctrines of his Church.

Roman Catholics would probably name as their true representative at this time, Dr John Milner. He was what Dr Geddes called a Papist as well as a Catholic. Milner wrote a 'History of Winchester' in which he made some reflections on the English Reformation, and he could not miss the opportunity of throwing a stone at the great enemy of ecclesiastical intolerance, Bishop Hoadly. Of this Bishop, Milner said that 'living and dying he undermined the Church of which he was a prelate.' There were still living in Winchester, men who knew and revered Hoadly and were prepared to defend both his memory and his principles. Among these was Dr Sturges who appeared in his defence and mingled with the defence 'Reflections on Popery.'

Milner's 'End of Controversy' was a general answer to all Protestants who in that age had impugned the Roman Catholic faith. It had been written in the time of the controversy with Sturges, but as the question of what was called Catholic Emancipation was then under discussion, Bishop Horsley and some other of Milner's Protestant friends

¹The grounds on which the Church of England separates from the Church of Rome.

advised him not to publish it at that time, as the civil interests of Roman Catholics would be better served by the cessation of controversy.

Some years later, on the appearance, of Bishop Burgess' 'Protestant Catechism' and other books in defence of the English Church as against the Papal, Milner felt that he could no longer withhold his composition. Bishop Burgess was his great target. The Bishop's argument from the difference between *Petros* and *Petra* was easily demolished. Jesus did not speak Greek but a Syrian dialect in which the distinction of gender in the word Cephas did not exist. Contrary to Burgess' theory of the independence of the British Church, Milner said that it had always acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope and had united with St Augustine to convert the Pagan Saxons. Milner's book was in the form of letters. Bishop Burgess was told that his Protestant Catechism was not wanted, for there was no increase in his diocese of those 'of the ancient faith,' and that his attention ought to be turned to the 'Methodist Jumpers' who threatened the existence of his Cathedral and caused the desertion of the Parish Churches.

Burgess had taken a motto from the 'Puritan regicide' John Milton, the representative of that 'genuine cant which brought Laud and Charles to the block.' He had also invoked the help of 'the Socinian Locke' and of Bishop Hoadly 'who had no religion at all.' The Bishop's Catechism was said to be more like the work of Lord George Gordon or some 'itinerant jumper' than of the successor of St Dubritius in the see of St David's. That St Paul had founded the British Church was a vision easily dispersed as well as many inferences that had been made from it.

The controversy was continued by Charles Butler who answered Southey's 'Book of the Church' in a publication called 'The Book of the Roman Catholic Church.' Butler, like Lingard and Milner, complained of misrepresentations and misunderstandings. The ground for complaint was probably good on both sides.

Butler asked for more charity as their creeds were much nearer to each other than was generally believed. Southey had described Papistry as 'a prodigious structure of imposition

and wickedness.' But was it decorous thus to describe the faith of the many millions which constitute the Catholic world? Forgeries, superstitions and feigned miracles might still be found among Roman Catholics as they had been in past ages, but the Church is only responsible for the authorised Articles of Faith. Miracles have never ceased in the Catholic Church, but no Catholic is required to believe any but those recorded in the Bible. St Dunstan may have punched the nose of the devil, but this is no part of the Catholic faith. Southey, like all Protestant historians, omitted to record such facts concerning the English Reformation as that, at the accession of Elizabeth it was opposed by all the Bishops except one, by the Houses of Convocation, and by the heads of houses at the Universities.

In a defence of his book, Butler explained that when Catholics say there is no salvation out of the Church, they include in the idea of Church all baptised Christians who accept the Apostles' creed by whomsoever they had been baptised. The Roman Breviary might be reformed, especially in the way of expurgation of the legends of the saints.

Phillipotts answered Butler. He did not admit any such close approximation of the creeds of the two Churches as had been supposed. But Roman Catholics coming in collision with Protestants or having political ends to serve, made such an interpretation of their doctrines as rendered them less offensive to Protestants. An argument had been drawn from the application to them of the name Catholic. Phillipotts answered, that in England until 1791, they had always borne the name of Papists. Much of the superstition into which the Church of Rome had actually fallen, was sanctioned by the decrees of Trent. Roman Catholics like Lingard and Butler reduced Purgatory to simply a middle state, but the Council of Trent made it far more than that. It was a place of torture for devout souls for a definite period, to continue perhaps to the day of judgment. As a matter of fact, indulgences had been given for the commission of sin. On the question of confession, on which an argument had been based for the agreement of the two Churches, Phillipotts said that there was nothing in common. Confession in the Church of England was only allowed to those who wished it, and in cases where the conscience was troubled.

The lines of thought among Protestant Dissenters correspond to those in the National Church. In the beginning or middle of the eighteenth century the old Presbyterians either conformed or became Unitarians. The Independents were more attached to the theology of Calvin, but with a tendency on the part of many to the heterodox side. At the end of the last century the students of Homerton College are said to have been enamoured of Danton, Robespierre and the French Revolution.¹ Many of them became Unitarians and some unbelievers.

A new era for the College dates from the time of the tutorship of Dr John Pye Smith,² who was probably the most influential man among the Independents during the first half of this century. He adhered to the theology of Calvin, but in a modified form. He refuted Unitarianism in 'Letters to Belsham,' and wrote 'Scripture Testimony to the Messiah,' in which what are called the Messianic prophecies in the Psalms are taken as referring literally and directly to Christ, and thus show His Divinity. A treatise on 'The Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ' follows the same principle of literal interpretation. Christ was really a Priest and offered a real sacrifice, the intrinsic value of which satisfied the demands of Justice. The only tendency to heresy which Pye Smith ever showed was in doubting the canonicity of the Song of Solomon. His doubts rested on internal evidence, yet from external he was afterwards convinced of its canonicity, but on what principles it was interpreted he never could determine.

Pye Smith was one of those who essayed the reconciliation of the facts of geology with the record of creation in Genesis. The time had come when these facts could no longer be set aside as mere theories or as the inventions of men who were enemies to the Christian faith. They were accepted by scientific men who were Christians, and could only be questioned by those who were ignorant of the subject, or who had beforehand determined to reject the conclusions to which they inevitably led. Dr Pye Smith was himself a geologist, and familiar with some other sciences necessary to the understand-

¹ Waddington's Congregational History, p. 34.

² B. 1775, d. 1851.

ing of geology.¹ In the bowels of the earth we have a record of the works of God, which had a claim on every devout and cultivated mind. It told us the past history of the globe, and it was believed to give presages of the future. Geology had experienced the fate of every new science. At first it was derided and rejected, but afterwards acknowledged, and used, if not to confirm old beliefs, yet to establish the same in new forms. True science is a Revelation. This was not said in plain words, but it lies at the root of the whole argument. The Revelation was progressive. Progress was seen in the history of the past, and the inference was natural that there would be progress in the future. The earth may still be in preparation for a more exquisite organisation. The existence of man as an animal species may terminate, and the end may be a resurrection to eternal life. Such thoughts as these arise naturally from the records of past ages.

The apparent discrepancy between geology and Genesis is admitted. The former says that this globe has existed through unknown ages, the latter seems to say that it has existed for less than 6000 years. Truth must be one, whether it is directly revealed by God or discovered by science. If there is an apparent discrepancy, its cause must be found in our misunderstanding one or other of the two Revelations. That pain and death came into the world by Adam's sin may not be the meaning of the words of St Paul. It is an ascertained fact that animals have for long ages in the past preyed upon each other. We may have misunderstood Genesis. It is not there said definitely that the world has not existed for more than 6000 years. The first verse in Genesis may be a distinct and independent statement of the first creation of matter. This is no novel interpretation. Fathers and Reformers had made it without reference to geology. Revelation tells us nothing of the interval between the first existence of matter and the work of the six days.

The Baptists have varied little from the theology of Calvin.² As a body they clung to it when it was dying out

¹ The title of the book was 'On the Relations between the Holy Scriptures and some points of Geological Science.' It formed the Congregational lecture for 1839.

² This of course means the Particular Baptists. The old General Baptists are as a rule Unitarians.

elsewhere in spite of Articles, Creeds and Chapel Deeds. Preachers who at their ordination reserved to themselves the right of private judgment, and of unrestrained address, still remained orthodox.

Robert Hall² the greatest Baptist preacher in the first half of the century, was more liberal than most of his brethren. He spoke charitably of such as Priestley whom he regarded as scarcely a Christian, yet expressed his belief that such men might be finally saved.³ Another minister remonstrated, maintaining that the lusts of the mind may ruin as effectively as the lusts of the flesh.⁴ He that does not believe in the Atonement, rejects Christianity. Hall answered that he was not a Calvinist, did not believe in the federal headship of Adam, nor in the imputation of sin. The evil entailed by Adam's transgression was a corrupt nature, and an irregular bias of the mind.⁵

As a Baptist, to him, infant baptism was a perversion of Christ's ordinance, yet he admitted that those who had been baptised when children by affusion of water were validly baptised. This admission was necessary for the side he took in the Baptist controversy about open communion. To refuse to communicate with other Christians was to convert the Lord's Supper into a religious test. Baptism was not really a necessary qualification for this Sacrament. A rigid Baptist⁶ maintained the contrary and held that sprinkling was a violation of the commandment, and therefore rebellion against the Divine Law. Such Baptists as Bunyan, who advocated and practised open communion, dispensed with the positive ordinances of the Gospel. These arguments were regarded as founded on an exaggerated view of this Sacrament, such as may be found in the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran and the Anglican Churches. St Paul always assumed that among Christians there would be diversity of sentiments, but they were to be of one mind. This tendency of man to go from the spirit and cling to the letter is the origin of idolatry and superstition. The genius of the Gospel is not ceremonial but spiritual.

¹ See for example the *Life of James Hinton* by his son, p. 106.

² B. 1764, d. 1831. ³ See *Works*, vol. vi, 19, 20.

⁴ Dr Ryland.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 27.

⁶ Abraham Booth in *Apology for the Baptists*.

Robert Hall, in his youth, defended the French Revolution, and rebuked a preacher who advised all ministers to have nothing to do with politics,¹ but he lived to be of another opinion and to speak of the vanity and ferocity which spring from sceptical infidelity.² He had also in his youth abused Bishop Horsley, called him the 'Bonner of his time,' ready to recognise in every persecutor a friend and a brother.³ He afterwards regretted what he had written as 'not consistent with the spirit of Christianity, or with the reverence due to departed genius.' Horsley had compassionated 'those venerable exiles, the prelates and clergy of the fallen Church of France,' which was contrasted with his malignity towards Dissenters. But the Baptist preacher himself, when he denounced the French Revolution, spoke of the French clergy as the Christian priesthood, and their churches as the temples of God whose worship had been abolished.⁴

Another Baptist of some influence in the early part of the century was John Foster. He was in the main orthodox, though he sometimes verged on heresy. He once wrote, 'I have discarded the doctrine of eternal punishment, I can avow no opinion as to the peculiar points of Calvinism for I have none, and see no possibility of forming a satisfactory one. I am no Socinian but am in doubt between the Orthodox and the Arian doctrine, not without some inclination to the latter.'⁵ Again he wrote, 'I believe the leading doctrines of the Calvinistic faith. As to my opinions respecting the person of Christ, a candid and honest statement would be, that I deem it the wisest rule to use precisely the language of Scripture. I am possibly in the same parallel of latitude as to orthodoxy, as the Reverend Doctor Watts, in the late maturity of his thoughts.'⁶ As to the constitution of the Church he went even beyond the 'dissidence of dissent.' Not only did he not believe in any such thing, but he avowed 'an utter loathing of what bears the general denomination of the Church, with all its parties, contests, disgraces and honours.' He added 'my wish would be little less than the dissolution of all Church in-

¹ Christianity consistent with the Freedom of the Press.

² Sermon on Modern Infidelity.

³ Apology for the Freedom of the Press.

⁴ Modern Infidelity. ⁵ Life by Ryland, p. 25. ⁶ Ibid, p. 28.

stitutions of all orders and shapes, that religion might be set free as a grand spiritual and moral element, no longer dogged, perverted, prostituted by corporative forms and principles.¹

The Wesleyan Community have a very definite creed and there have been but few deviations from it. Dr Adam Clarke, their only really learned man, was their only heretic. He was supposed to have shown a Pelagian tendency, and he incurred great reproach by incorporating into his Commentary the substance of 'The Key to the Epistle to the Romans' by John Taylor of Norwich, an Arian or perhaps a Socinian. On the questions of predestination and the argument from the divine foreknowledge, that God must have preordained all things because He foreknew them, Clarke said that foreknowledge is never spoken of in reference to God, but only to man. God has omniscience or the power to know all things, just as He has omnipotence or the power to do all things, but He may not choose to know all. With God is no past or future, but an eternal *Now*. He has left some things as contingent, and to other agencies besides His own.

Dr Clarke did not believe in the Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ. He wrote² 'If Christ be the Son of God as to His divine nature, then He cannot be eternal, for son implies a father, and father implies in reference to son precedency in time, if not also in nature. Father and son imply the idea of generation, and generation implies a time antecedent to such generation. If Christ be the Son of God in His divine nature, then the Father is of necessity, prior, consequently superior to Him. Again if the divine nature were begotten of the Father then it must be in time, that is, there was a period when it began to exist.' This is to destroy His eternity and take away His Godhead. 'To say that He was begotten from all eternity is in my opinion absurd, and the phrase Eternal Son is a contradiction. Eternity is that which has had no beginning, nor stands in any reference to time. Son supposes time, generation: and father, time antecedent to such generation. Therefore the conjunction of these two terms, son and eternal,

¹ Ibid, p. 54.

² See his Commentary on Acts ii. This idea was not new. It is found in Dr Pearson's Warburtonian Lectures, 1807-11.

³ See his Commentary on Luke i, 22. 35.

is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially different and impossible ideas.'

These words evoked a controversy in which several preachers took a part, the chief of whom was Richard Watson.¹ Many passages of Scripture were quoted to show that Jesus Christ was the Son of God not merely in His humanity but also in His Divinity. He was the *Only Begotten Son* and had declared that God whom no man hath seen at any time. An Apostle said 'we have seen His glory as the glory of the only Begotten of the Father.' Again 'God so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten Son.' Here is an emphasis which would have been out of place, if as Son, Christ had been merely human and not divine. In the doctrine of the Trinity the first person is the Father of a divine and not of a merely human Son. Jesus referred to His miracles in proof that He was the Son of God, that is divine. To the argument that the son must be posterior to the father, and therefore inferior, the answer was that in the divine Sonship of Christ no priority of the Father is supposed. A father as such is not prior to his son, nor is a son as such posterior to his father. The inference therefore of the inferiority of a son to a father is not valid. Richard Treffry, another preacher, maintained that all the confessions of the disciples that Jesus was the Son of God, related to His divinity and not to His Humanity. He also urged the consent of the Catholic Church.

Dr Clarke pronounced the Eternal Sonship of Christ an absurdity which could not be believed, and he defended the right of reason to be heard in all that professed to be Revelation. His words are ; 'The doctrine which cannot stand the test of rational investigation cannot be true. We have gone too far when we have said such and such doctrines should not be subjected to rational investigation, being doctrines of Revelation. I know of no such doctrines in the Bible. The doctrines of this book are doctrines of eternal reason, and they are revealed because they are such. Human reason could not have found them out, but when revealed, reason can both apprehend and comprehend them.' Again, 'no man either can or should believe a doctrine that contradicts the nature of

¹ Eternal Sonship of Christ.

God, but he may safely credit, in anything that concerns the nature of God, what is above his reason.'

The distinction between *above* and *contrary to* was not new, and it was open to the objection that if there are things concerning the divine nature which are above our reason, then we have not faculties to enable us to judge of what is contrary to the divine nature. But the proposition that we can believe nothing but what is agreeable to reason is denounced by Richard Watson as a 'pernicious principle,' as if the meaning of Scripture were to be determined by our views of what is reasonable. It means that man's reason is not only to be the instrument of investigating the meaning of the Revelation, but also the judge of the doctrine revealed. Faith is something higher than this. It is the evidence of things not seen—faith in the divine testimony. They are blessed who have not seen and yet have believed. The Eternal Sonship of Christ may transcend human capacity, but it had never before been considered incompatible with His Divinity. A severe sentence was passed on what Clarke had said about doctrines of Scripture being 'not only apprehended but comprehended.' Priestley and Belsham had acted on this principle, but nowhere had they stated it so broadly. But since it is admitted that there may be things above reason, it follows that there may be something revealed which reason cannot comprehend.

The leader of the Unitarians, in the beginning of the century was Thomas Belsham. He had been educated among the orthodox or Calvinistic Nonconformists, but was early taught to use his own judgment. One of his first books was on the Evidences of Christianity.¹ It followed largely the argument of Paley and of such writers as proved Christianity by external evidences. The influence of Locke is also to be clearly traced, especially in the definition of what constitutes a Christian. A believer in Revelation is one who believes that Jesus of Nazareth was a Teacher sent from God, to reveal the doctrine of a future life with rewards and punishments. He also believes that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. Revelation is distinct from natural religion. Reason un-

¹ 'A Summary View of the Evidences and Practical Importance of the Christian Revelation,' 1807.

assisted never attained to a clear perception of God and His moral law. Miracles are the proper and absolute proof of Revelation. These can only be the work of God, and miracles done in past times may be proved by testimony. In certain circumstances falsehood is not possible. It is more credible that Jesus rose, than that the testimony concerning His resurrection should be false. The facts of Christianity can only be explained on the hypothesis that the Christian religion is true. For such an uncommon effect there must be an adequate cause. The truth of the gospel narrative does not rest on the idea of plenary inspiration but on historical evidence. The books of the New Testament are in the main genuine, and they contain an authentic account of facts and doctrines believed at the time they were written. The writers were Apostles or companions of Apostles, and could not be themselves deceived. They were not deceivers, for they were firmly convinced of the facts. They embraced, avowed, and promulgated a religion hostile to their prejudices, inclinations and interests. Their testimony was not contradicted by those most inclined to contradict it. No fact in history is so well supported as the resurrection of Jesus. Had there been imposture it could have been at once detected by the production of the body. Another proof of the truth of Christianity is the fulfilment of prophecies, especially those made by Jesus Himself. Then there is the character of Jesus. It was perfectly original, unlike anything which ever appeared in the world. The doctrines too were just what suited the wants of man. Christian morality is perfect. The writers of the New Testament had a deep sense of the importance of the truths revealed. Such questions as the age or authorship of the Pentateuch are quite independent of the question of evidence.

In a sermon on Creation¹ the preacher argued against the inspiration of the book of Genesis, on the ground that it is a compilation of ancient documents. The inconsistency of the different documents is plainly incompatible with the idea of inspiration. The writer of the first record of creation² though ignorant of astronomy, was a pure and consistent Theist, and bears testimony to great and important truths, such as that God is of infinite power, and that He is perfectly wise and

¹ 1821.

² Chaps. i, ii, 4.

good. These sublime truths were probably derived from an original Revelation. The meaning of the record is simple, but in its obvious sense not true. To reconcile the record with philosophical truth, much ingenuity has been exercised, but only to twist and torture the words of the writer, who though right in his theology had no better knowledge of the facts than his own speculations derived from the most obvious appearances of the universe.

The Unitarian position was defended in 'Letters' addressed to Howley, Bishop of London. The Bishop in a charge had spoken unfavourably of Unitarians. Belsham expressed his surprise at this treatment, as Unitarians did not desire the downfall of the Established Church. For the last twenty years not one of them had preached or published anything on the subject. In truth, they were so favourable to the National Church, that if the petition of forty years ago for the substitution of the Bible in the place of the Articles of Religion had been complied with, and the Liturgy reformed upon the principles of Dr Clarke, the benches of Unitarian chapels would have been greatly thinned. The Bishop had divided Unitarians into those who were conscientious, and those who were Atheists, Deists or licentious Free Thinkers. Belsham answered that Unitarians believed everything necessary to salvation. They confess with their mouths that Jesus is Lord, and believe in their hearts that God hath raised Him from the dead. As to infidels the retort was easy. When men cast off all religion but the profession, they generally desert the sects and become members of the Established Church. Bolingbroke was a High Churchman and a persecutor of Nonconformists. Gibbon was a placeman and professed great zeal for orthodoxy of faith. The Bishop had said of Unitarianism: 'Its influence has generally been confined to men of some education, whose thoughts have been little employed on the subject of religion, or who, loving rather to question than learn, have approached the oracles of divine truth without that humble docility, that prostration of the understanding and will which are indispensable to proficiency in Christian instruction.' To this a parallel was found in Hume, 'Whosoever believeth the truth of Christianity is conscious of a continual miracle in his own person

which subverts all the principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to reason and experience.' Belsham added that the confines of orthodoxy and of infidelity approach more nearly than the Bishop perhaps recollected.

The Unitarians published an improved version of the Bible, which was understood by many to be an improved Bible, made to suit their theology.¹ In the Bampton Lectures of 1819, Dr Moysey made Unitarianism the subject, and criticised the new Bible. He said the Trinity was rejected because it was incomprehensible. This was met with a direct negative. The Trinity was rejected because it was, according to some expositions of it, a manifest contradiction, and in every form unfounded in reason and opposed to Scripture.

The Lecturer said that the Unitarians had expunged or altered many passages of Scripture which bore witness against them. He denied that any one could be a Christian even in profession who did not hold that the man Christ Jesus was also very God. The first statement was declared simply untrue, and the second was answered in the words of Locke that 'believing Jesus to be the Messiah, and a good life were the indispensable conditions of the new covenant.' To the statement that a doctrine may be true, though reason cannot comprehend it, the answer was that this is a mere truism, but though Trinitarians use the same words their ideas are often as opposite as light is to darkness. Sherlock said that there were three persons in the Trinity as distinct as Peter, James, and John, so that really there were three gods. Wallis on the other hand, made the persons merely modes, or relations of God to His creatures. Bishop Burgess said that not one of the three was a being, so that three nonentities constituted God.

The object of Unitarianism at this time was to get rid of Trinitarian texts. In a future chapter it will be found that later in the century they became indifferent to texts. It will also be seen that Unitarianism runs along the whole line from the borders of orthodoxy to the bourne of non-belief.

¹ A Unitarian preacher has described the Unitarians of the school of Priestley and Belsham, as asserting the divine authority of the New Testament, yet 'explaining away passages which distinctly assert the opposite view with a most curious and perverse ingenuity.' See 'These Eighty Years,' by H. Solly, vol. ii, p. 101.

CHAPTER IX

COLERIDGE, ERSKINE, HAMPDEN, WHATELY, COPLESTON,
HAWKINS, ARNOLD, MILMAN

THE new spirit which animated the nineteenth century was first manifested in poetry and science. There were tributaries from Germany in the way of transcendental philosophy and intuitive religion. There was also the spirit of inquiry which seemed the destruction of old beliefs. Then there were movements by way of reaction, and counter movements against these. It was only necessary for one force to be in action to evoke other and opposing forces. Nature, commonly regarded as a dead mechanism, was now seen by the poets as instinct with divine life. In the same direction was the doctrine of evolution.¹ The poets most conspicuous in this connection were Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey. In their youth, they were devoted to freedom, with the ardour of those who expect to reform the world, but were sobered by the excesses of the French Revolution. They became conservative in politics, strong Churchmen, and if they did not always defend things as they were and had been, they were not eager for change. Wordsworth and Southey stood by the dogmatic form of orthodox theology. Coleridge² helped most in the transition to a new era, while he reflected new light on what was old. His writings are fragmentary, and his

¹ Evolution may be regarded as the counterpart of the immanence of Deity in Nature. In the time of these poets it was not recognised as it has been since, but it was beginning to speak though not as yet with an audible voice.

² B. 1772, d. 1834.

thoughts often little more than guesses or suggestions. For sixteen months he was a Unitarian; a deviation from the Catholic faith which he afterwards deeply lamented. His restoration was due to the discovery that the 'Trinity was reason.' Unitarianism he spoke of as the *Sans cullotisme* of religion.¹ He was drawn to it by its promise of a rational theology, and he was repelled by its materialistic philosophy. His own philosophy was spiritualistic, and his theology rational, but in the new sense, borrowed from the Germans, which he gave to the word reason as distinguished from understanding. The latter is merely sensuous, that is, depending on the senses, and is variable in every individual.² Reason on the other hand is universal. It is the image of God and the same in all men. Those who follow understanding inculcate a faith which has no demonstrated harmony with the attributes of God, or the essential laws of humanity, while the lessons of reason are self-evident; 'whatever *finds* me bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit.'³ This is not rationalism, which is defined as such a use of the rational understanding in reference to religion as involves the forgetfulness of the spiritual and the divine. It tries the modes and laws of spiritual existence by the mere understanding.⁴ Reason on the other hand tests the truth of a doctrine by its correspondence with the rational, moral and spiritual ideas within us.

The spirit in the letter of the Bible is the voice of God, but the letter itself is the work of pious yet fallible and imperfect men.⁵ The Bible is the book for man. It is his guide in all things moral, spiritual, prudential, in all that is private, domestic, political, but the astronomer, the chemist, and all such must go elsewhere. The Bible is inspired, but the Holy Ghost did not dictate the words, so as to convey infallible information.⁷ In the early Church the words of a dead Apostle were not more inspired than the words of a living bishop. The same spirit which guided the Apostles also guided the

¹ Literary Remains, vol. i, p. 231.

² Aids to Reflection, vol. i, p. 11 preface.

³ Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit, p. 11.

⁴ Ibid. vol. ii, p. 19.

⁵ Lit. Rem. vol. iv, 16.

⁶ Ib. iii, 15.

⁷ Confessions, p. 12.

Church. We are not to seek the truth of Revelation in external evidences after the manner of such evidence writers as Grotius and Paley. The truth of Christianity has its evidence in itself, which is its fitness to our nature and needs.¹

To Coleridge even what we call the mysteries of Christianity were comprehensible by reason. This does not mean that he did not admit a mystery behind and beyond all things, but that so far as they are revealed, they are facts of reason. The Trinity is God the Father, I AM, ipseity, the Son or Word altereity, and the Holy Ghost or Spirit of truth and wisdom communieity. Man is in his nature spiritual. There is in him a root of the divine. Original sin has its origin in the will of man. The counterpart is Redemption, which also is inward. St Paul's metaphors, expiation, atonement, propitiation, satisfaction, set forth aspects of Redemption taken from his own experience and the experience of those whom he addressed.

The Church is spiritual and invisible known only to the Father of spirits. This is the Church Catholic which has for its opposite the World. But there is also the Church National—the Church of a state or kingdom. To the care of this Church belong all the interests of the community, as its health, commerce, industry, civilisation. This theory has been compared with that of Hooker, which made the Church and State the same thing under two different aspects, but Coleridge seems to have meant that religion was not to be separated from common life, for the secular was sacred. His 'Clerisy' was not merely the clergy but the learned of all denominations—the sages and professors of law, medicine, and physical science. In short all the so-called liberal arts and sciences, the possession and application of which constitute the civilisations of a country as well as the theological.

Thomas Erskine² of Linlathen was in many respects unlike Coleridge. The one was a philosopher, the other a pietist. Erskine's theology took its form from opposition to the prevailing Calvinism of Scotland. He probably did not know how little of it was new, but the want of this knowledge gave much which he wrote the freshness of originality. The Gospel was to him as to Coleridge its own witness. It commended itself to every man's conscience. One of his first

¹ Confessions 63.

² B. 1788, d. 1870.

books was called 'Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the truth of Revealed Religion.' He could not understand a religion coming from without to be believed on authority. It must be self-evidencing, seen and felt as divine truth. He was what Neander would have called a 'heart' theologian. The Gospel was in the highest sense reasonable, fitted to meet the wants of man as a spiritual being. God's way was not so dark but that in His light we could see light. He was not so unlike man but that man could have some true thoughts of what He is, was not so arbitrary as to require belief in anything that did not find an answer in conscience and reason. God's ways must be right and for man to believe in God he must know and feel that what God does is right. Otherwise there is no ground for faith.

Erskine's position will be more easily understood if we recall the circumstances of his life. He was not a theologian but had studied law. He had been carried away with the scepticism which prevailed in the society with which he mingled in his youth. But by patient study of the gospels he found the light and peace for which his spirit longed. In Scotland the common belief was that God in His dealings with man was guided by a sovereign will, that the character of those dealings man was not able to understand, his duty therefore was faith and submission. Reason rebelled, but had not St Paul said, 'Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?' The chapter from which these words are quoted was, or is, the stronghold of the argument for the sovereign or arbitrary decrees. The ninth of the Romans is doubtless a difficult chapter. If there be any place in the Bible which teaches that we are to believe something contrary to what we conceive to be the moral attributes of God, it is here. Predestination and reprobation are not only asserted, but facts in the history of the Hebrew people are here adduced in proof. This is the apparent sense, but surely St Paul could not mean what he seems to say, that we must give up our reason and believe doctrines which make God neither just nor merciful. Erskine said this was not necessary. St Paul had no such meaning. The illustration of the potter's vessel is taken from Jeremiah, where it is used to guard against this very error into which the Jews had fallen, that

they were unconditionally elected to be God's people.¹ God's choice rested on character as is seen in the rejection of Ishmael and the election of Isaac.

This interpretation may not have been the correct one, but if any scripture seems to make God unjust we must have mistaken its meaning. All the doctrines of Christianity, properly understood, commend themselves to the intellect, as well as to the heart of man.

In opposition to the unreasoning assent demanded by Calvinists, and those who call themselves Catholic, Erskine said, 'In a system which professes to be a Revelation from heaven to contain a history of God's dealings with man, and to develop truths with regard to God's moral government of the universe, the knowledge and belief of which will lead to happiness here and hereafter, we may expect to find an evidence for its truth which will be independent of all external testimony.'² This is illustrated by the supposed case of a traveller going from Sicily to China in the time of Archimedes, and supposing that steamboats were known in China at that time. He might return with the proverbially incredible stories of travellers. One of these would be about the steamboats, but, when he explained their principle to Archimedes, the philosopher would exclaim that this at least is true. The reason is that it bore internal evidence of its truth, and that is stronger than all external testimony. We have the same kind of evidence for Christianity which Archimedes on this supposition had for steamboats, a general truth in relation to the character both of God and man.³ Hence the inference that the Apostles must either have witnessed what they record, or have been the most marvellous philosophers the world has ever seen. Their system is true to the nature of things, even were they proved to be impostors. The tests of religion are that it should coincide with the moral constitution of the human mind, and that it should coincide with the natural or physical constitution. This is explained that it must have a necessary tendency to excite natural emotions in behalf of goodness, and to draw the current of our affections and will into the moral channel. It must also

¹ Doctrine of Election, p. 19.

² External Evidences, p. 15.

³ *bid*, p. 16.

coincide with the circumstances in which man is found in the world. What the Gospel tells us is new but not strange. Had the atonement for instance been merely a pardon without a sacrifice it would have been but a weak, obscure appeal to the understanding, or the heart. It would not have demonstrated the evil of sin, nor the graciousness of God. In Christianity there is that which answers to the natural light of reason, and the counterpart of this is that no amount of external evidence can ever prove that what appears to us really absurd can ever proceed from God.

This is further seen in Erskine's view of faith which is referred not to the mode of believing, but to the object believed.¹ A man may understand what he does not believe, but he cannot believe what he does not understand. This is not setting reason above Revelation, for Revelation is addressed to reason and feeling. The Atonement has in it a moral meaning. The Trinity also is comprehensible, because 'when assumed it serves as a scaffolding or substratum for the doctrine of the atonement and of sanctification through the Spirit, and so it is connected with the plan of the moral manifestation of God and the regeneration of man.'² This is illustrated by the case of a man born blind. He 'has no impressions from light and therefore can have no faith with regard to such impressions. He has not the slightest conception of what colour in a body is and therefore cannot believe in a coloured body.'³ The truths of the gospel must be understood in order to be believed, and felt in order to be understood.

Some of the details in doctrine may be briefly summed up. There must be a new life before works acceptable to God can be done, and those who have this new life are conscious of it. Pardon is unconditional, just as the Jews looked to the brazen serpent so we must look to Christ. He died not as our substitute, but because He had taken our nature which was fallen and which suffered in Him. He took it into Himself to redeem it and make it divine. He did not suffer to dispense with our suffering, but to enable us to suffer to the glory of God, for the purification of our nature. Pardon does not remove penalties, but shows them to be full of love.'⁴ The

¹ Essay on Faith, p. 19. ² Ibid. p. 34. ³ Ibid. 39.

⁴ The Brazen Serpent, p. 451.

present life is not a state of trial, but a process of education devised by that eternal purpose of love which brought us into being.¹ Some other points are that baptism declares our sonship; that all men will ultimately be restored; that we should look to Christ, not to Christianity, and that eternity is not constituted by duration but by God.

Coleridge and Erskine were laymen. They met opposition but they did not create a panic. The first heaving of the storm that was to come was caused by the Bampton Lectures of 1832. Dr Hampden² chose for his subject 'The Scholastic Philosophy,' and dealt with the origin of dogma. He started a real difficulty, touching the question of Revelation, and how it could be understood by the imperfect and fallible intellect of man. Something may be revealed, and yet we may but imperfectly understand the Revelation. On the assumption of an infallible Church, the definitions of Councils or other Ecclesiastical authorities are final, but not if the Church merely represents the judgment of fallible man. The latter is professedly the position of a Protestant Church. The revelation may therefore be divine, while the interpretation of it is human.

As a fact of history, the dogmas of theology as we now have them, were shaped by philosophy or the fallible agency of man. They cannot therefore be the pure Revelation, but only an imperfect embodiment.³ The object of the Lectures is to give 'an account of the effect of opinions, as such, on the doctrines of Christianity; how the intellect of man has insinuated its own conclusions into the body of the Revelation in the course of its transmission.'⁴ While the authorities of the Church have always opposed the successive efforts of Rationalism, they have in the end adopted the very systems which they opposed. Peter Lombard was condemned for the freedom of his speculations and the use he made of reason, but he became an authority in the Church.⁵ It was the same

¹ 'The Brazen Serpent,' vol. ii, 185. ² B. 1792, d. 1868.

³ Dr Döllinger at the Munich Congress in 1863 said the same as Bishop Hampden had done concerning the Aristotelian Schoolmen.—'Their analytical processes could not construct a system corresponding to the harmony of revealed truth.'

⁴ p. 6.

⁵ p. 40.

with Albertus, and still more with Aquinas. After their deaths, elaborate exercises of reason which the Church had denounced, became part of the common stock of ecclesiastical authority.

The Church System changed the whole aspect of Revelation. It was made one contemporaneous production, instead of the record of God's dealings with the successive generations of man.¹ In the theological creeds there are great variations on such subjects as the Trinity and predestination. These are fine metaphysical speculations. All that is really revealed is something extraordinary about the Divine Being and His agency in the world. The Lectures seem to mean that beyond this we can only attain an imperfect apprehension and expression of what is revealed.

The Scriptures record facts. These are ever the same, but the opinions or doctrines which are inferences from them are the work of man, and continually change. The application of reason to the facts of Revelation has generally begun with heretics. They have proposed their explanation or modification, and it has prevailed according to the circumstances of the time, or the influence of the promoters. At one time nearly the whole of Christendom was Arian, and at another Pelagian. When it was so, the scriptural theologians could not refrain from mingling in the conflict, but they could only speak in the terms already used by the heretics, and so they obscured the truth as it stood in Scripture. The scholastic philosophy, which was long the ecclesiastical vesture of the Church's dogmas, was derived from Aristotle.

The natural inference from Dr Hampden's Lectures was that he set aside the whole body of dogmatic theology held by orthodox Christians. This inference was not admitted. In his sermons he taught the common faith of Catholic Christianity, and in his inaugural Lecture as Professor of Divinity he declared his belief in all the doctrines of the Church of England as commonly understood, and as expressed in the phraseology, traceable to the Aristotelic theories of the Schoolmen. The sum of the matter is that man will reason, and that he will put his conceptions into dogmatic form, and will regard this form as absolute truth.

¹ p. 88.

All dogmas are in the form of credenda, and are meant to exclude their opposites. It is only the philosophical theologian who professes to believe a doctrine when that which underlies it is what is really believed. Revelation itself is only relative, God is revealed to us under such figures and in such language as we could understand. In the Scriptures there are, properly speaking, no doctrines, but merely facts. The substance of Revelation is not the words or propositions of inspired writers, but God's dealings in the world. In illustrating this distinction, it was said that the Nicene and Athanasian creeds involved scholastic speculations, while the Apostles' creed contains nothing but facts.¹ The argument seems to be narrowed to the simple question of the distinction between dogmas and doctrines, or what the Lecturer calls facts.

The Lectures were unnoticed until 1836, when the author was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity. A pamphlet was circulated with the object of getting up a clerical protest against heresy. It was called 'Elucidations of Dr Hampden's Theological Sentiments.' This was the work of John Henry Newman. It had the usual, perhaps inevitable fault of partial quotation, or passages taken apart from the context, oblivious of the general argument. The principle that Revelation is in the Scriptures and not in the dogmas or inferences drawn from them is called Socinian, and what is even worse it had been advanced by Bishop Hoadly, who on the authority of some other bishop, was pronounced worse than a Socinian. Another writer, now known to have been Dr Pusey, supplemented the 'Elucidations,'² and found that it was the mark of all heretics to prefer the words of Scripture to the dogmas or definitions of the Church. The primary creeds could not be Aristotelic, for they were made before the Schoolmen existed, and so before Aristotelian philosophy found its way into the Church.

Dr Hampden defended himself in many ways. The 'Elucidations' he described as a pamphlet full of gross mis-

¹ p. 544.

² Dr Hampden's Theological Statements, and the Thirty-nine Articles compared, by a resident member of Convocation.

representations. He wrote,¹ 'It is one thing to endeavour to unfold the theories on which a particular phraseology is employed in the systematic statement of divine truth, and adapted to its purpose, and quite another thing to state that the truths themselves, which that phraseology expresses are mere theories, or mere opinions, or probable conclusions having no certainty in them. The latter misconstruction belongs to those who have taken it up, it is not mine.'

In his Inaugural Lecture he said that the foundation of all his doctrine was Jesus Christ, God with us, taking our nature and suffering for our sins. He received the doctrine of the Trinity in the full sense in which the Church has expressed it. The Scriptures were the supreme authority for all truth. He did not dispute the authority of the Church, but it could not be brought into competition with that of Scripture. We are to use all aids for the right understanding of what is written. The use of reason does not mean the use of reason uninformed, but after using all means to form a right judgment. In any case reason must be the ultimate judge of what is true or false. The use of the word 'fact' as synonymous with doctrine is defended by the words of Butler, 'Doctrines which are matters of fact and precepts come under the same notion.' Fact in philosophical language is not restricted to something done. This is its literal sense, but in general it means whatever *is*. It is applied to the truths of Scripture not so much as matters taught, or as truths systematically stated, but as they are matters revealed.

What Hampden said in his Lectures is repeated in a pamphlet called 'Observations on Religious Dissent with particular reference to the use of religious tests in the University.'² The argument was that as all hold in common the belief in Revelation, there should be no exclusiveness on the ground of doctrinal propositions, which are not to be identified with the simple religion of Jesus Christ. Propositions concern the intellect. Religion concerns the heart. Each party professes to be seeking revealed truth, but in reality is merely following its own inferences. The Roman Catholic decides positively that his inferences are the truth, but Protestants are free to inquire if the inferences are

¹ Letter to Lord John Russell.

² 1834.

legitimate. The different sects confused theological and moral truth with religion. They agree as to the facts, but differ as to their reasonings on the facts.

The question is raised if no conclusions are to be drawn from Scripture by human reason. The answer is that such conclusions are not properly religious truths or necessary to salvation. Scripture alone is necessary, not tradition nor any human authority. The question is carried further; the truths of Scripture must be expressed in the form of conclusions from Scripture. Christ's divinity, for instance, is it to be expressed only in Scripture words? To this the answer is that any collection of Scripture expressions into one body of statement amounts to a human exposition. The technical terms in theology, though inadequate for the expression of truth, have yet an important use. We must not put our conclusions from Scripture on a level with the truth which Scripture itself declares. Christianity is revealed to babes. It is not theological opinion. Unitarians, for instance, take their dogmas for religion. They prefer them to the broad outlines of Scripture and dissent because other people do not agree with them in their conclusions. Unitarians are Christians, but their theology is wrong. Love to Christ makes a Christian, not theological opinions.

It is admitted that theological opinion and its expression are necessities. We cannot escape them. We cannot sweep away the accumulation of ages, but we can obviate its evil effects. It exists, but it ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society. Articles of Religion represent an accidental state of public opinion. Dogmas take their complexion from the controversies of the times in which they are formed. The real unity of the Church is invisible. It is the union of Christians with the Holy Spirit. Theological *odium* is proverbial, but there is no such thing as religious *odium*. We should avoid the dogmatic spirit. Dissenters should not be excluded from the Universities because they are Dissenters. Tests should be abolished and the Articles themselves might be profitably revised.

Another clerical protest followed Hampden's appointment to the See of Hereford.¹ His principles were described as

¹ In 1847.

infringing and injuring the Word of God as a revealed rule of faith and practice, in its sense and use, power and perfection. On this, Julius Hare wrote, 'Verily this does bespeak no ordinary effrontery to bring forward an accusation of this kind, against a divine, the object of whose writings is to assert the exclusive honour of the Scriptures as the sole infallible depository of eternal truth.'

Whately said there had been persecutions as unjust and as cruel, but for impudence he never knew the like. Samuel Wilberforce at first joined the protesters, but after a careful study of the Lectures, he found no heresy in them and declared Newman's extracts most false. Gladstone too, had protested, but thirty years later he wrote to Hampden a penitential letter, saying that though he had studied the Lectures for a whole generation, he had never understood them, but regretted that he had condemned merely on the information of others.

Dr Hampden was made a Bishop. His heresies were forgotten, or became a thing of the past. He was reckoned a moderate High Churchman,¹ and he lived to level a Charge at Bishop Colenso.

Hampden belonged to a group of men most of whom were connected with Oriel College and were known as the Noetics.² The name indicated their characteristic which was force of intellect. They were not Mystics nor Pietists, but hard reasoners, and might be regarded in some respects as the successors of the Cambridge men represented by Paley and Watson. The chief of the Noetics was Richard Whately, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin.³ In 1818, he wrote a pamphlet called 'Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon Buonaparte,' which was intended to show how far scepticism might go in a mind disposed to be sceptical. Though no one ever doubted that there was such a person as Napoleon, it would be hard to prove that he ever existed. His existence is one of the things taken for granted, but these are often the

¹ See *Life*, by his Daughter.

² The famous men of Oriel were Copleston, Davison, Whately. These were followed by Keble, Hampden, Hawkins, these by Arnold, Pusey, Newman, and Marriott.

³ B. 1787, d. 1863.

very things which are not true. Charles II puzzled the Royal Society by asking why a vessel of water does not increase in weight by having a live fish put into it, while it does increase if the fish be dead. After many experiments it was found that the assumption at the base of the question was a mistake. It was objected to Copernicus that if the earth turned on its axis, a stone falling from the summit of a tower would not fall at the foot, but at some distance in the same way as a stone dropped from the mast head of a ship. Some centuries had passed after the death of Copernicus before the assumption about the stone from the ship mast was found to be false. The existence of Napoleon is taken for granted but not proved. The accounts of him are very diverse, and if we only believe what is well authenticated, we may doubt that he ever existed. It may be argued that there are people in England who have seen Napoleon, but this may only be that some persons went to Plymouth and saw a man with a cocked hat. The feats ascribed to him are barely probable, and it is a well-known fact that the more marvellous anything is the less likely is it to be true. The exploits of Napoleon are so improbable that they would not have been believed had they been found written in some old book. They would have given rise to such speculations as we have about the gospels. The acts of Napoleon would have been ascribed to many different heroes, just as are those recorded by the Evangelists. This would have been confirmed by the name Buonaparte, or good part. The deeds ascribed to him would be the deeds of the *good part* of the French army. We believe in the existence of Napoleon, though we cannot prove it, and the same kind of evidence should suffice in other cases.

A volume of University sermons, preached about the year 1820, gives an early indication of the kind of theology from which Whately never departed.¹ The first was on a future state. It was not provable by reason. It was not believed by Pagans. It was not known in the Mosaic dispensation, but Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light. He *revealed* the life to come. It was the great subject of apostolic preaching. The heathen had conjectures about the

¹ Essays on some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion.

immortality of the soul, but the gospel teaches the resurrection of the body. The Pagan idea of immortality was that the soul returned to the bosom of the universal spirit, and so personality was gone. No metaphysical arguments could prove the improbability of a future life, nor could they prove its certainty. In the Old Testament there are a few scattered but doubtful texts. If Moses had intended to teach such a doctrine to such a people as the Jews, and under their circumstances, he would have stated it clearly, and dwelt upon it in every page.

Another sermon or essay was on the Declaration of God in His Son. We are so surrounded with natural objects, and so occupied in worldly occupations that it is hard to lift up our thoughts to God. Of a being whose nature is so incomprehensible we can only have a negative knowledge. We do not know what He is, but rather what He is not. We say God is a spirit, but we have only a faint notion of spirit except the negative one that it is not a body. God is eternal, but we are bewildered with the very idea of eternity. The sentiments of Archbishop King on the unknowableness of God are endorsed, but though we cannot know God, 'His only-begotten Son hath declared Him.' The religion of philosophers was cold and rarely rose to worship. The multitude of people on the other hand worshipped angels, demi-gods and saints—something conceivable by the mind. Jesus Christ as God Incarnate was an object of affection for the philosopher, and those who craved a god in finite form could worship Him without idolatry.

In 1822 Whately was Bampton Lecturer. His subject was 'The use and abuse of Party Spirit in matters of Religion.' Party feeling is defined as the spirit of attachment to a party. This is a feeling inherent in our nature. It is not in itself evil, but it is subject to abuse. It was the source of union and also of division. The persons who separate are not always the persons guilty of schism. The conduct of orthodox Churchmen has often been the fruitful cause of division. There may be different modes of viewing the same thing. Division is only caused by evil. All that is necessary to the Christian life is plainly revealed. There may be things beyond our capacity going out into mystery, but we should not

seek to be wise above what is written, or to define what Scripture has not defined. Sabellian and Arian meant right at first, but they were driven into extremes by opposition. It is natural for people to get wedded to their opinions and their parties and become more intractable the more they are opposed, difference being often due to misunderstanding. The lesson is charity, impartiality, caution.

Whately followed reason as it is commonly understood. Logic, argument, common sense, were to him inspiration. In a treatise on 'the Kingdom of Christ,' he argued that the Christian Church knew nothing of sacrificing priests. Scripture was the rule of faith, and no interpretation of Fathers could supersede private judgment. The coercive power of the civil magistrate is not to be exercised in the cause of the Church, nor are the members of any particular Church to claim a monopoly of civil rights.

Christ instituted a community or system of communities. The Church was not merely a revelation of certain truths, but a combination of men who were to be 'members of the body of Christ.' A community must have officers, or rulers, as well as members. Jesus acknowledged the authority of the officers of the Jewish Church, though He charged them with making void the authority of God through their traditions. The constitution of the Jewish Church was known to Christ's disciples. They could have had no doubt about what was meant by the authority of the keys, and the binding and loosing. The Christian Church was left free to adapt itself to the requirements of every age and country. At first there was no liturgy, no fixed form of worship, no rubrics, no canons. A religion without sacrifice or temple was a new idea both to Jew and Gentile. Jesus Christ was its only priest. His offering on the cross was its only sacrifice, and the worshipping people were its only temple.

The different churches or communities were branches of the spiritual brotherhood. They have no earthly head, nor has one society dominion over another. We know nothing more of the constitution of the Church as established by Christ than that it is a society. This is so meagre, that it has left room for some to deny altogether the idea of a ministry, and for others to suppose an apostolical succession.

The latter is so obscure and uncertain that it has led to doubt and schism, the very evils which it was intended to prevent. In Article XIX, *the* visible Church should have been translated *a* visible Church. The Reformers intended the Church of England to be such a Church as Christ had formed. The Church is one just as the human race is one, but not as a society. From the moment the gospel was preached beyond the precincts of Judea, the Church as a society ceased to be one. To appeal to the 'primitive Church,' or to the Ancient Catholic Church is to appeal to something which never existed, in the sense supposed. When the Reformers appealed to the Fathers it was simply to defend themselves from the Romanist charge that they were introducing novelties.

We may now anticipate what Whately has said in other books on the Church and Christianity. Men must be addressed as rational beings. The counterpart of this is that the doctrines of Christianity, so far as they are revealed, are rational and not mysterious.¹ Objectors to reason generally say 'mere' reason, or reason alone. To this it is answered that reason alone is no more meant than if a ship provided with a rudder and compass were said to be brought into harbour by them alone. We believe in Jesus because He did the works of His Father. We refuse to believe in Mohammed. The difference is that in one case there is evidence which appeals to reason. This rational spirit is in all Whately's theology.

The value of a Sacrament is not in the material consecration, but in humble trust in God's promises. Scripture is the rule of faith, but it is not to be so used as to exclude light from other sources. The Bible is not to be superstitiously carried into the battle field as the ark was into the camp of the Philistines. It is not intended to check inquiry, or to keep out light. If geology, astronomy, or any other science has anything to tell us it must be received as truth. We do not receive the ten commandments, because they had the authority of Moses, but because they were moral. The fourth was the only one concerning which there was any doubt. It was to be received so far as it could be shewn to be moral.

¹ Parish Pastor, 76.

To follow Whately in his public life is beyond our province, but here also he was guided by the supremacy of reason, or common sense, as opposed to any kind of authority. He approved of the suppression of the Irish bishoprics, which to Newman and Keble was sacrilege. They were not necessary. The suppression would be a benefit to the Irish Church. This was an argument sufficient to counterbalance all considerations of the sanctity of sees, or successions. He advocated the civil rights of the Jews, and he disapproved of the conduct of the Irish clergy who refused help from the Education Board because it did not enforce the teaching of the Scriptures to Roman Catholic children.

The rising energy of Oriel is usually dated from the Provostship of Edward Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff.¹ Copleston wrote little. His 'Inquiry into the Doctrine of Necessity and Predestination' follows in the lines of Archbishop King, afterwards taken up by Whately. King's principle that Revelation does not reveal God, that is to say, does not absolutely but only relatively, tells us to keep within the limits of what it is possible for us to know. While God in Himself is unknowable there must always be difficulty in understanding His ways. When we speak of Him, we speak after the manner of man, and this makes it apparently a necessity that we fall into contradictions. If we foreknow anything it is certain to come to pass, otherwise we have not really foreknown it. If God foreknows everything we make the same inference, yet God deals with men as if they were free, and all future events are contingent on the action of free agents. We must thus acknowledge a truth in Calvinism as well as in its opposite.

Edward Hawkins² who succeeded Copleston as head of Oriel, wrote a pamphlet in 1819 on Unauthoritative Tradition. He argued against the idea of tradition as an authority, or as understood in the Church of Rome. On the other hand, he maintained its value against such Protestants as set aside all tradition and adhere to the Bible alone. In reference to the first position, all traditions which contradict Scripture are to be rejected absolutely. But there may be traditions, which, though unsupported by Scripture may yet accord with the

¹ Born 1776, d. 1849.

² B. 1789, d. 1882.

dictates of reason. As to the second position, the argument is that the tradition or oral teaching is necessary because of the unsystematic form of the Scriptures.

In 1840 Hawkins was Bampton Lecturer. The development of the Tractarian movement had given the subject a new interest. The pamphlet was expanded into eight lectures making the argument applicable to the circumstances of time and place.¹ Christian truth may be discovered. All religious differences are not to be merged in sincerity. But how is the truth to be found? It is in the Scriptures, and not to be altered by any decrees of Church or Council. On tradition alone no doctrine can be founded. The religion, however, of the Bible is not opposed to human creeds or human teaching. The Bible is not meant to teach Christianity in the first instance, but is addressed to Christians who have already believed. It was not the book but living teachers who were to evangelise the world. To the objection that St Paul said 'the Scriptures could make wise unto salvation,' the answer is found in the words which follow 'through faith which is in Christ Jesus.' The faith we are first taught by the Church, and directed to the Scriptures for confirmation and proof. It is impossible that any man who had no previous teaching, but only the Scriptures, could ever deduce from them the doctrines of the gospel. An objector illustrated Dr Hawkins' argument by the difficulty of understanding Plato, and the consequent necessity of having recourse to the New Platonists.

Hawkins defended the Apostolical succession² both as a fact in history and as a necessary doctrine. He objected, however, to the use of the Athanasian Creed.³ He called the synodical declaration concerning this creed not an explanation but an alteration. It was said in the declaration that the damnatory clauses did not pronounce judgment on any particular persons. But this was not the view of the controversialists in the century in which the creed was written. They delighted in cursing. We cannot use the words in the sense which the writers intended. Taken literally and in the

¹ The title is 'An Inquiry into the Connected Uses of the Principal means of attaining Christian Truth.'

² Sermon, 1842.

³ Considerations on the Athanasian Creed, 1874.

obvious meaning they require an exactness of belief as necessary to salvation far beyond the mind of the Church of England. The very fact that the advocates and admirers of the creed proposed a declaration, shows that even in their judgment it needed explanation to make it really useful in the public service. It rather obstructs than promotes devotion and impedes rather than encourages a sincere and cordial belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation. It is said by some that the last clauses attest the danger of misbelief as well as unbelief, but one of the effects of its being read in the services of the Church is to produce unbelief. Some defend the objectionable clauses with the words of Scripture 'He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.' But there is no correspondence between the two cases. Scripture does not say, *must* thus think, after a minute explication. The sharp and peremptory words are alien from the tone of the New Testament. They are painful to many Christian minds, are evidently the product of an unhealthy age and too much resemble the polemics of the fifth century.

Hawkins was much opposed to the movement which was identified with the names of Newman and Pusey. He objected to the use of *θεότοκος* as applied to the Mother of Jesus, but he disliked still more the ordinary English, French or Latin translations of this word. The ideas and phrases which were becoming common in Oxford were wholesale importations from French Roman Catholic writers.¹

Thomas Arnold² was also of Oriel, but left Oxford to be Master of Rugby.³ He was famous as a schoolmaster, a church reformer, and a liberal churchman. He advocated the rights of the Roman Catholics, even at the expense of the Established Church in Ireland. The first principle of his religion was to do what is right. To be unjust for the sake of what we may think truth, is to show a want of faith in truth. It is, moreover, impolitic; the more, for instance, we deny the Roman Catholic what is due to him, the more devoted he becomes to his superstition. It is because Ireland has been persecuted that it has remained Roman Catholic. The persecuted naturally hate the religion of their persecutors.

¹ Sermons on Scriptural Types and Sacraments, 1851.

² B. 1795, d. 1842.

³ In 1826.

The reforms proposed for the Church of England were extensive. The attack on the Church was violent and unreasonable, but the same was true of the Church's defence. Some of the reforms proposed were the commutation of tithes and the remodelling of the Episcopal order. Bishops were not to be translated, and their incomes were to be more equalised. Dioceses were to be divided, new districts formed, and clergy who neglected their duty, or were incapable of performing it, to be speedily removed. The phantom uniformity was no more to be pursued. It only allured men from the attainment of what is a real and substantial union. The Church was to be made wide enough to comprehend the great body of those who at present were Nonconformists. The chief difficulty would be with Quakers, Roman Catholics, and Unitarians. It was also desirable that the Church should not be identified with any one class of society, but that all should be represented. To be truly national, every class should have a share in its government. The Scotch Church had failed in not reaching up to the level of the aristocracy, and the English Church in not coming down to the level of the working people. Changes in patronage were also recommended, so far, at least, that unfit persons might not be instituted.¹

Dr Arnold contemplated a work which he did not finish, in which he was to carry out the idea of Hooker, and in some respects of Coleridge, that the State and the Church were the same body under different aspects. The principles of the gospel were to be the guide in civil legislation. Next to Popery, one of the greatest devices of Satan has been to advance his own kingdom by keeping Christian principles out of civil society. The Church had been identified with the clergy. This was the first and fundamental apostasy. Church and State in their ideals have one object, that is the highest welfare of man. To accomplish this the State must act with the wisdom and goodness of the Church, and the Church must be invested with the sovereign power of the State, these being in reality not two societies but one. What Arnold seems to mean is that there should be a closer alliance

¹ See Miscellaneous Essays, specially one on Church Reform.

between religion and the State, that the Church should not be a mere clerical body over against the State and separate from it, but a power to maintain the supremacy of public righteousness. This, and not systems of worship, is the aim of Christianity, and the national forms as the organs of public righteousness are to be used as its main instrument.

Arnold's views of the Bible and Revelation are found in an essay on the 'Right Interpretation of Scripture.'¹ He starts with the principle that what holds good of natural gifts holds good also of Revelation. We must apply ourselves to it with a sound understanding, and a sincere and teachable heart. Some read the Bible as if it were like the Koran, all composed at one time and addressed to people similarly situated. But a command given to one man or to one generation of men can be binding on other men and other generations, only in so far as the circumstances are the same. God's Revelation to man is gradual, and adapted to his condition in the different periods in which it was made. Commands were given at one time which would not have been given at another time. In every revelation of God to man there must be accommodation, unless it pleased God to change man's state from that of imperfection to perfection. A command from the Infinite to the finite must be in accordance with the views of the latter. Complete knowledge could not be given on one point without extending it to other points, so that the knowledge conveyed must be adapted to our ignorance.

Henry Hart Milman,² though not of Oriel, may be classed with the Oxford Noetics. He was Bampton Lecturer in 1827, when he argued for the truth of Christianity from the character and conduct of the Apostles.³ The argument was conducted after the manner of Paley, and the theology was at least as orthodox as Paley's. A great revolution had been effected in the world by the preaching of a few men gathered together in an upper room. They changed the whole constitution of society, and their work is as remarkable for its permanence as for its extent. This was due to the inherent

¹ Preface to Sermons.

² B. 1791, d. 1868.

³ The Character and Conduct of the Apostles considered as evidence of Christianity.

life and power of Christianity. 'Wherever civilisation is most perfect, knowledge most extended, reasoning most free, Christianity obtains its ground.'¹ The world was changed by the counsels of poor and illiterate men, so it appears on the human side, but according to the Christian scheme this revolution was effected through the direct and visible interposition of the Divinity. Hence we must either believe this miracle, or as St Chrysostom said, believe a greater miracle, that the world was converted without miracles. The authenticity of the Acts is vindicated after the manner of the *Horæ Paulinæ*. The conclusion of the whole is, 'We cannot separate, we cannot tear asunder the miracles from the narrative. Christianity would not have existed without them, supposing the main facts of the history true, and that the main facts are demonstrated has been fully shown.'²

In 1829 Milman published his 'History of the Jews.' This was an application to Jewish history of the modern spirit of inquiry which had been successfully applied to the history of other nations. The book contained what would even now be called advanced criticism. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is accounted for from natural causes. These cities may have stood on a broken soil undermined with veins of bitumen and sulphur. Set on fire by lightning these inflammable materials would cause a tremendous conflagration. The walls being of combustible material, the cities were swallowed up by the fiery deluge. Thus 'the valley which had been compared to Paradise, and to the well-watered fields of the Nile became a dead and fetid lake.'³

The story of Sarah and Abimelech being so like what happened in Egypt may be a traditional form of the same transaction. Abraham was a Sheik or Emir not in any way superior to his age, 'except in the purity of his religion.' The arrest of the sun and moon in Joshua was no miracle, but simply a poetical representation. The cruelty of Elijah accords with the ferocity of his time. The sun dial of Ahaz going backwards, was the shadow on the dial going backward which might be caused by the cloud refracting the light. The angel which destroyed the army of Sennacherib, may have been the Simoom or hot pestilential wind of the desert. The writers of

¹ p. 4.² p. 301.³ p. 16.

the Bible were not infallible in matters of science and history, they simply followed the ideas of the times. There is no Bible chronology. The disposition of the Jews to magnify numbers makes all calculations uncertain. The 'History of the Jews' raised such a storm that the publisher had to stop the series of which it formed a part.¹ Dean Stanley says that this was 'the first decisive inroad of German theology into England, the first palpable indication that the Bible could be studied like any other book, that the characters and events of the sacred history could be treated at once both critically and reverently.'

Milman's next work, 'The History of Christianity' gave offence chiefly to one Church party. A reviewer² in the *British Critic* said 'there was so much to shock people in the book, that there was comparatively little to injure.' It would help those who wished the destruction of Catholic views, that is the Evangelical party, who, at the same time, would not see that the same principles applied to New Testament history and teaching. It was 'a most dangerous and insidious work.' All were to abstain from it 'who carp at the Fathers, and deny tradition, who argue against sacramental influence, who refer celibacy to Gnosticism, or Episcopal power to Judaism, who declaim against mysticism, and scoff at the miracles of the Church, while at the same time they uphold what is called Orthodox Protestantism.' The reason why they are to abstain is, because 'on their controversial principles, the reasonings and conclusions are irresistible.'³

Milman distinguished between what was essential in religion and what was merely extraneous and accidental. At the end of his greatest work, the 'History of Latin Christianity,' he spoke of dogmatic systems falling into disuse, certain portions of Scripture submitting to a wider interpretation, and being harmonised with the conclusions of science. That which would continue was the unshadowed essence of divine Truth, as enshrined in the words of Christ. The primal indefeasible truths of Christianity would never pass away.⁴

¹ The Family Library.

² Newman.

³ Vol. XXX. p. 113, 1841.

⁴ Conclusion.

CHAPTER X

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES

THE origin of the Tractarian movement is ascribed by Newman, in a classical passage in the *Apologia*, to Keble's sermon on National Apostasy.¹ The text was I Samuel, xii, 23, 'As for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you.' The Apostasy was what was called the reformed Parliament, into which were admitted Roman Catholics, 'Jews, Turks, Infidels, Heretics,' and other Dissenters. As the Israelites in the time of Samuel, wishing to have a king to be like the heathen nations, rejected God and His prophet, so the English people had got a Parliament which cast off the profession of Christianity. This Parliament was to govern the Church, usurping that commission which had been given to the clergy. We have nothing left but a Parliamentary Church, an Erastian Establishment. The reformed Parliament was reforming the Church in a way that to Churchmen like Keble, seemed sacrilege. Irish bishoprics that were no longer needed, were to be suppressed, and though the revenues were to be used in strengthening the Church, yet a bishopric was a thing too sacred to be abolished by a secular government.

The Church was not only in danger of being reformed by Parliament, but it was in itself weak. It was not making progress, while Dissent of all kinds was rapidly increasing. One party proposed extensive reforms, others regarded the proposed reforms as in themselves injurious. Since the time

¹ July 14, 1833, before His Majesty's Judges of Assize.

of Laud there had always been a party who maintained that the Episcopal constitution of the Church was divine. With the extinction of the Nonjurors that party was apparently extinct. Evangelicalism was the only really great religious power, but its principles were not essentially different from those of Nonconformists. A distinct ground was wanted for the defence of the Church as a divine Institution. This circumstance will explain why many who were educated among the Evangelicals readily fell in with the Tractarian movement. Another cause assigned was the progress of Rationalism as imported from Germany. It came from a Non-Episcopal Church, a Church without a divine commission, and it was subversive of the doctrine of the infallible inspiration of the Bible. The precursor of Tractarianism in this relation was Hugh James Rose, Incumbent of Hadleigh in Essex, once the benefice of the famous reformer and martyr, Rowland Taylor.

Rose published a book on 'The State of Protestantism in Germany.' Some of the German theologians had altogether discarded miracles; others had sought to establish the truth of Christianity entirely on internal evidence to the exclusion of the external. They had accepted the principle that though there might be much in the Bible above reason, there was nothing contrary to reason. Under the shelter of this they accepted what doctrines they liked, and rejected what they did not like, and so got rid of the chief doctrines of Christianity. This Rationalism was the result of the want of efficient discipline. The Church of England held fast by the truths taught in the first ages, when what is truth must have been known. Other Protestant Churches held that perhaps in no age had truth been really recognised, that her genuine forms may yet remain to be discovered. This is not to believe in the divine guidance. God has given the Church the power to understand the truth contained in the Bible. It is absurd to suppose that Revelation was so obscure as not to be understood by its first propagators. We go to Scripture as the fountain, but for explanation of difficulties, to those who lived at the beginning of Christianity. The very idea of Revelation is that something was clearly revealed at the outset. With this idea development is not consistent. We have a definite

revelation, and not mere elements or germs, to be brought to maturity by the exercise of reason. This is what the Germans have believed, while the Church of England has taken the safe ground of the Bible as interpreted by the Fathers. Dr Pusey was as yet so far in the way of reason that he defended the German theologians.

All who have written on the Tractarian movement are agreed as to its origin. Dean Church speaks of dangers from the crude revolutionary projects of the Reform epoch, and the necessity there was for something bolder and more effective than the ordinary apologies for the Church. This meant that the apologists must dwell more on the divine right of Episcopacy and the efficacy of sacraments. They were not to be afraid of enthusiasm, as the churchmen of the eighteenth century had been. Bishop Lavington thought enthusiasm was only fit for 'Papists and Methodists,' but it was found in Cranmer, Hooker, Andrews and Ken, and was not extinguished till the age of Tillotson, Secker, and even Porteus. The clergy of that time were good sort of men, influential in many ways, but the idea of the priest if not quite forgotten, was obscured. They slumbered and slept. Whately and Arnold dissatisfied with the stagnation of religious opinion on many subjects, 'agreed in seizing the spiritual aspect of the Church.'¹ The inspiration came from Keble and the impulse from Froude, then the work was taken up by Newman who found that he must force on the public mind that great article of the creed, 'I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church.' After the publication of Froude's 'Remains,' many who had gone with the movement drew back. They still believed that the Reformers were Catholic, but all parties are now agreed that they were Calvinists, and that they paid extravagant deference to the oracles of Geneva and Zurich.² Already there were fears that the movement was in the direction of Rome. Isaac Williams said that the new

¹ Letters by an Episcopalian in some sense the work of Whately. So Dean Church believed, but it is now doubtful. See *Supra*, p. 57. As for Arnold, his idea of the Church was just what the Tractarians said a Church ought not to be.

² If this which Dean Church acknowledges had been recognised by the Tractarians, much discourse might have been saved about the English Reformation being a *Via Media*.

generation had forgotten the old church watchwords and maxims. The approbation of Newman for this was freely quoted, but Newman was still in the *via media*, as appears from his Lectures on Romanism and popular Protestantism. According to Dean Church, the old high churchmen were not so 'high and dry' as popular opinion represented them to be. The 'jovial parsons' indeed belonged to them, but there were daily services and fasting and sacramental reverence. They were put to shame by the zeal and courage of the Evangelicals, but this party had degenerated, had accommodated themselves to the requirements of respectable congregations, and had no theology or vigour of thought. A critical school was becoming strong inside the Church, while Bentham and the men of science were without. The great historic party, that is the High Church party, were hitherto imperfectly conscious of their position and responsibilities.¹

William Palmer's² 'Narrative,' first published in 1843, is to the same effect. In the Introduction to the edition of 1883, the writer says, 'We all contemplated with the deepest alarm the general abuse of principles which led to the inundation of the press by publications recommending the most vital alterations in the Prayer Book and our whole system, merely by Act of Parliament.' The leaders had agreed that tracts or essays were an imperative necessity. No plan had been arranged when Newman began to write tracts which came to be invested with the character of representing the whole party. The Tracts, though against Latitudinarianism, were to be written with perfect freedom of speculation in defence of the unity of the Church. The natural result was freedom in the direction of Rome. Newman and his friends denied the imputation of secret Romanism, but it is not to be denied that they did sometimes lay down principles which 'were either Romish or approximated to Rome.' In 1839 Dr Pusey wrote a defence of the Tracts in a letter to the Bishop of Oxford, but failed to recognise that there was a party tending towards Rome. Among other causes which roused the

¹ See Dean Church on the Oxford Movement.

² There were two William Palmers. This was known as of Worcester College, the other was of Magdalen, and became a Roman Catholic.

Tractarian party to life and action, Palmer enumerates the repeal of the Test Acts in 1828, and the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, which scattered to the winds public principle, public morality, and public confidence. In 1833 the Church of England and Ireland seemed verging on ruin. Destructive schemes of Church Reform were put forth by such writers as Lord Henley, Dr Burton, Dr Arnold, and it was even believed that some of the prelates were in favour of the abolition of the Athanasian creed, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and of absolution by the clergy.

The object of the Tracts is openly avowed in the preface. It was to revive doctrines 'now obsolete,' to give higher reasons for adherence to the Established Church than 'mere decency and order,' and so to check the lamentable increase of sectarianism. These higher reasons were that sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of grace, and that an Episcopal, which is taken to be the same as an Apostolical, ministry has virtue in it. The doctrine of sacramental grace had been so long forgotten that the Church stunted her children who 'go off to their foster-mothers, Methodism and Popery.' To those who know the history of parties in the Church of England there was nothing new in these positions, but to the majority of Churchmen they had a suspicious air of restoring doctrines supposed to be exploded.

The first Tract¹ went at once to the great question, the commission of the clergy. Here was the ground of independence of the State and the reason for standing apart from all Non-Episcopal communities. The Church had fallen on evil days. It had neglected its 'Apostolic descent.' The Methodists who had not this gift were making progress, while the Church was making none. The clergy were ignorant of the mysterious powers committed to them at their ordination, and were exhorted to stir up the gift that was in them.

Other Tracts followed on the same or on kindred subjects. The grand difficulty with the 'commission' theory was to get over the Reformation. English Orders came through the Church of Rome. Did we not in separating from that Church break the Apostolic succession? The Bishop of

¹ Newman.

Rome and those in communion with him had the commission. If we separated from them they had it still while we had it not. The answer is that the Church of England reformed itself. No new Church was founded. In 1534 the bishops and clergy in their Convocations rejected the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. Queen Mary indeed reduced our Church again to the See of Rome, but under Elizabeth the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their ancient rights.¹

Another subject was the conservation of the Prayer Book² as it is. Revision was sacrilege. The idol must not be touched. The old Church had a much larger Prayer Book, and there must be no farther retrenchment. It was an old complaint that the services were too long, a yoke which neither we nor our forefathers could bear, but they were not to be shortened, not even if shorter services were to help to fill the churches.

The ordinary Protestant doctrine of grace is that it is given in all religious ordinances, whether sacraments or otherwise. It is given in prayer, sermons, meditations. This is described in the Tracts as Puritan and Latitudinarian, and is contrasted with the Church system, by which sacraments are 'the direct means of conveyance to the soul.'³ This has by some been called 'mechanical,' but it is quite in accordance with the idea of a Church endowed with mysterious gifts of grace.

It was necessary to define and defend the position of the Church of England in relation to Presbyterians, Dissenters, Latitudinarians and Romanists. The Presbyterians were compared to the Apostate Kingdom, which revolted under Jeroboam; they were the Samaritans. The Church was the Jews. The Heathen were on one side, the Church on the other, and the Presbyterians midway between. There they were left for God to deal with them as He thought fit, and probably they felt like David, that it was better to fall into the hands of God than into the hands of man. God had given a revelation in the Church and they did not receive it.⁴

¹ Tract 15, Newman and Palmer.

² Tracts 5 and 7, Bowden and Newman. ³ Adv. vol. ii.

⁴ Tract 47, Newman.

The Dissenters were not even in so good a position as the Samaritans. They were simply sinners, for dissent is sin. The dissent of some of them was accidental. It may have been the misfortune of birth, or of ignorance. In that case they fell short of sin, just as killing is short of murder. The degree of their guilt will be reckoned by their opportunities of knowing better. But the Church is the way to eternal life, and there is only one way. We ought therefore to receive the Church of our forefathers as we receive the Scriptures, to obey its authority, and to keep its unity, the breaking of which is schism and sin.¹

Three Tracts² were devoted to Baptismal Regeneration. Like other doctrines, it must be believed before it can be understood. Some people included baptism among those external things which are only husks and shells. But it is God's institution and therefore not to be classed with non-essentials or even with less essentials. One Tract is on the danger of losing the grace of baptism. The baptised are the illuminated, those who have been once 'enlightened,' of whom it is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews that if they fall away it is impossible to renew them. All the Fathers bear witness that if the privileges once conferred are forfeited, they cannot be again conferred. There can be no repetition of baptism. Those who fall away may be restored, but they can never be in the same condition as those who have kept the white robe of baptism undefiled. There is no second remission or extinction of sin such as has taken place in the one baptism. The Romish Church was so far right in saying that baptism could not be repeated, but it has continued to restore men by Penance, which thus becomes a second baptism. We may run into another error and suppose that at any time we may be washed in the blood of Christ. But there is only one washing, and if we are again defiled there is no more washing in this life. The change in baptism is regeneration. This is the Catholic faith. This is the regeneration which cannot be repeated. Any second baptism after this is baptism of another kind. It is not the new birth but only a revival or renewal of the life that had been given. This explains some passages in the Fathers where regeneration is spoken of as

¹ Tract 51, author not known. ² 67, 68, 69, Pusey.

sometimes after baptism. It was regeneration in the sense of reformation.

The subject was continued in another Tract which began by contrasting the English Reformation with that in other countries. Their Churches were new. They bore the character of their Reformers. The English Reformation retained the old Catholic Church. It was by divine favour that the seed sown by Wycliffe was allowed to lie in the ground and so we did not become Wycliffites. The same operations of grace acted as impediments in the way of Reformation in the time of King Henry, so that the work was not done rashly. Again, when in the days of Edward the Reformers were going too rapidly down the stream, they were checked by the unexpected death of Edward, and the fires of the Marian persecution. But at last by divine providence the Temple was restored, according to the pattern which God had shown in the primitive Church. The foreign Churches suffered for their error. Luther's consubstantiation was merely a mode of explaining that which cannot be explained. Those called the Reformed went still further from the primitive doctrine of the Sacraments. Zwingle and his follower Calvin made baptism a sign of initiation, whereby we are enrolled in the society of Christ's Church, that being engrafted into Christ we may be accounted among the sons of God. There may have been a difference between Zwingle and Calvin on the sacraments. With the one they were testimonies to the whole Church, with the other only to the elect, but with both baptism was merely a sign of God's covenant not an 'instrument of grace.' The Eucharist, in like manner, was not a conveyance to the soul of the believer of the body and blood of Christ, but an external emblem by which faith is strengthened.

After the usual arguments for regeneration as a complete moral change in and by baptism, the Tract writer answers objections. One, a very natural one, was that we do not see in the baptised children any more signs of grace than we see in those who have not been baptised. Those who made this objection were answered that they had 'a dull-hearted and profane unbelief.' It was Rationalism of the very worst kind. It made our reason to be the judge of God's doings. The

writer lamented the influence which the foreign Reformers had exercised on our Reformation. Our services bear the traces of Zwingli and Calvin. But for Martin Bucer the English clergy might still have been allowed to exorcise the devil before the administration of baptism.

Latitudinarianism or Rationalism was dealt with as represented by Erskine of Linlathen, and Jacob Abbot, an American divine. To rationalise is defined as asking questions which are out of place, refusing to believe certain things unless they can be accounted for. The typical Rationalist was Nicodemus, who asked, 'How can these things be?' or those who said, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' Another was Hume who limited the possible to the actual, believing it impossible for God to do anything greater than what we see is done. Erskine had said that he might understand many things which he did not believe, but he could not believe anything addressed to his reasoning faculty which he did not understand. Rationalists were informed that Revelation is a mystery, in part revealed but in reality concealed. Mystery in Scripture had been explained as that which was once concealed but is now revealed.¹ In opposition to this it was said that a mystery is a doctrine of which the one side is illuminated and the other still secret. Things under the law were not a mystery because they were not known, but began to be a mystery by being revealed. So then what is revealed is still mysterious and to be accepted, not by reason but by faith, which in the last analysis seems to be simply submission to authority.

Popular theology is contrasted with the Catholic faith. The one centres in the Atonement and its effect upon our minds, the other embraces also such doctrines as the Trinity, and the Incarnation. Sacramental efficacy is in a sense outside the sphere of reason. Erskine found that the object of the gospel was to bring the character of man into harmony with that of God. This stamped him as a Rationalist. It is measuring divine revelation by human standards. Revealed doctrines are not motives to conduct, but objects of faith. Jesus did not ask Nicodemus to look at the practical aspect

¹ By John Toland and afterwards by Archbishop Whately.

of what He taught him, He simply asked him to believe. While Erskine saw in the gospel the manifestation of God, the Tract writer saw the gospel more in the mystery unveiled than in what was revealed. Jacob Abbot's Rationalism was of the same kind as Erskine's. He dwelt on the human side of Christ's character and said little about expiation. Thus while the Catholic faith says that God is man, the Rationalist says that man is God. Abbot spoke of the invisible as manifested in Christ. This in the Tracts is called by the vague appellation Pantheism. To find in the gospel chiefly what commends itself to the intellect or reaches the heart and feelings is 'the snare of the Protestant world.'¹

Three of the tracts² were intended to prove that all authority in the Church was committed to the Bishops. That was so well-known in antiquity that heretical sects took care to have a bishop through whom the Apostolical succession might be continued. Episcopal anathemas in former times were the Church's main safeguard against misinterpretation of Scripture, and in modern times nearly all non-episcopal Churches have corrupted the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Church of Scotland may be called an exception, but something may be ascribed to its vicinity with the Church of England. The objection is anticipated that the Church of Rome with its Episcopal succession has grave doctrinal errors. The answer is that 'in the degree that the Roman Church has swerved as a Church from Christian verity, she has laboured also to induce her subject bishops to part with their claims to a succession, properly Apostolical.' This is shown from the debates in the Council of Trent, where the Papal legates maintained that bishops have their authority not immediately by divine right, but through the See of Rome, 'A remarkable proof that the spirit of Popery, as of all anti-Christian corruptions, shrinks back, as it were, instinctively from the presence of Apostolical principles of order.'

Tract 71³ was on the controversy with the Romanists. The various doctrines on which Protestants differ from Roman Catholics were discussed, and the Roman side condemned. Bossuet had represented many of these doctrines under a

¹ Tract 73, Newman. ² 52, 54, 57, Keble. ³ Newman.

modified form, but we had no evidence that this form was the right one. For English Churchmen to go over to Rome would be to disobey the apostle's injunction against disorder. Every one should abide in the same calling wherein he is called. We are the Anglican regimen, and should remain in it till our opponents have shown why we should change, till we have reason to suspect that we are wrong.

The Tract¹ which evoked most controversy, and gave most offence, excepting, of course, Tract 90, was on 'Reserve in the communication of Religious Knowledge.' Had this reserve meant merely that God had communicated religious knowledge in the degree that men could receive it, that there had been a progressive development, or education of the race and that we in like manner should adapt our instructions to the capacities and circumstances of those to be taught, the Tract might have passed unnoticed. But it had a controversial object, and to find the true key to its meaning, we must look at it as aimed at the work of the Methodists and the Evangelical clergy. The strength of the argument is that in God's manifestations to men there is a kind of veil, as the revelation would be injurious to those not in the right disposition to accept it. Intimations of this are found in the obscurity of Christ's birth, the place of that birth, and His seclusion for thirty years. The conduct of Jesus on many occasions points to the same thing. He evaded questions put to Him, and instead of answering gave the thoughts that were in His own mind at the time. He veiled the truth in parable. His miracles were private. He sometimes enjoined secrecy. There is no unveiling of mysteries to the capacities of men, but a demand for obedience as the only way for the reception of truth. Those who approach it by speculation are punished with blindness. Truth is the reward of holiness. The Fathers were holy men, therefore they must have had truth. They could not have been, as some people say, very weak, injudicious, fanciful.

The practice of reserve is contrasted with that of the modern religious world. The object now is to hasten the knowledge of God, that it may cover the earth as the waters

cover the channel of the sea. We see the Bible circulated by men of all creeds and churches, through the loss of discipline thrown open to all. This is dispensing with church and sacraments, creeds and liturgies, while the highest doctrines are pressed home to all persons indiscriminately, and especially to those living unchristian lives. The writer does not say 'publicans and sinners,' so the reader is left to discover the distinction or to include Christ among the erring preachers. Fearful apprehensions were entertained of the evils which may follow this mode of preaching Christianity. The multiplication of churches, cheap publications, national schools, are among the means of making knowledge easy and pressing it home to all. This utilitarian principle forgets the precept, not to give holy things to dogs, nor to cast pearls before swine. It will defeat itself, for men despise what courts their favour. The Atonement is preached as the great doctrine of Christianity, but St Paul preached Christ crucified, and the necessity of our being crucified with Him. The degeneracy in the Church of England began at the Revolution in 1688, when the Church lost Ken and Kettlewell. Since then there has been no preaching of Christ crucified. The present religious activity is a reaction against the eighteenth century, but our zealous preachers have only caught at the shadow and missed the substance. The subject is resumed in another Tract, where it is shown that the Fathers taught reserve, and that the Holy Catholic Church had always a *Disciplina Arcana*.¹

The Tract which closed the series has always been admired for its amazing dialectic subtlety.² It made the Articles of Religion though professedly keeping to the grammatical sense, teach the contrary of what to all men of ordinary understanding seemed the meaning of the compilers. It is admitted that they were written in what is called an uncatholic age, that is the age of the Reformation, yet they are not uncatholic, but may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic. Whatever adjective may be put before that word it is here meant as the opposite of Protestant.

The first experiment was made on Article VI, which says that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved

¹ Tract 87.

² 90, Newman.

thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' What is meant by Holy Scripture is defined, and the books enumerated and described 'as those of which there never was any doubt in the Church.' The Apocryphal books are also enumerated as not canonical, nor to be used to establish any doctrine, though they may be read for example of life and manners. There is a word by the way for the Apocryphal books. Though they are not canonical, the compilers of the Articles do not say they are not inspired. Then it is found that the Article does not say that Holy Scripture is the Rule of faith. This is a common supposition but it is not correct. Our old divines show other rules of faith besides Scripture, such as Apostolical tradition, the Creeds, the first four councils, rules without which it is not safe to judge things by the Scriptures alone. The phrase itself would be better avoided, but in the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture is not on Anglican principles the rule of faith.

Article XI says 'That we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine.' The Tract writer finds that it does not exclude justification by baptism, and justification by works. The Homilies make faith the sole means but not to the exclusion of other means. Faith may be the sole inward instrument, while baptism is the outward. So works may justify as well as faith but in a different sense. Article XIII says that 'Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit are not pleasant to God, neither do they make man meet to receive grace, or as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity.' Article XII, however, says 'Albeit, good works which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification cannot put away sins and endure the severity of God's judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and so spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith.' The Tract writer supposes an intermediate state between works done before and works done after justification. The Article says nothing of it, but does not deny it. This state is represented by Cornelius not yet justified, yet by divine aid doing works of alms, prayers, fastings which dispose men to receive the grace of justification.

Article XIX says, 'The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments are duly administered.' Is this a definition of what the Church ought to be or a description of what it is? The first was the common interpretation. The Article declared what a church ought to be, and then spoke of churches that have erred. Hence Archbishop Whately said, we ought to read not 'the visible church' but 'a visible church.' The Tract writer says, 'The Article is a description of the existing One Holy Catholic Church.' The proof is found in quotations from Fathers and Reformers, who affirm that there will always be a Church, and that it consists of faithful men. The Article ends with the assertion that the Church of Rome and some other Churches erred. The Tract writer finds the Article descriptive of the Catholic Church diffused throughout the world, which being one cannot be mistaken. By making the Article describe and not define the Church, two things are secured: that there is a Catholic Church to which the Anglicans belong, and to which 'Kirks'¹ and Connexions do not belong.

Article XXI says that, General councils 'may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining to God.' The Tract writer finds that the councils may err, yet there may be councils so guided by the Spirit as not to err. Such were the first four, perhaps six, and are therefore called Catholic Councils.

Article XXII condemns 'the Romish doctrine, concerning Purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints.' The Tract writer remarks on this that what is condemned is the 'Romish' doctrine. He found in one of the Homilies a certain kind of veneration paid to relics. He found that the Romish doctrine condemned was not even that of the Council of Trent, but the popular doctrine of that day, and he adds 'unhappily of this day too, or doctrine of the Roman schools.' Other doctrines of Purgatory may be held though this is condemned. The 'pardons' were 'large and reckless indulgences

¹ In this sneer at Kirks, the Tract writer must have forgotten that Kirk, Kerk, Kirche are only different forms of the word Church.

from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments.' The Council of Trent restrained such abuses, but the decrees of the council are evaded. This same council admitted and forbade 'enormities in the veneration of relics and images.' The 'Invocation of Saints' condemned, is all such addresses to them as entrench on the incommunicable honour due to God alone, not the invocation of saints for help, but the abuses are condemned.

Article XXV says, 'Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel.' The Tract writer finds that though they are not sacraments in the sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments, that is, having an outward sign ordained by God, yet they are sacraments of the Church through which grace is dispensed. Article XXVII says, 'Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ,' etc. The Tract writer says, that what is here condemned, is the doctrine of a change into such a body of Christ as may be pressed with the teeth, or what would be called a material body, an earthly, fleshly, organised body. That this had been taught in the Church of Rome is shown by many authorities, but it is also shown that our Homilies teach a presence, and the rubric in the Communion Service says that the presence of Christ's body is in heaven and not here. How then can there be a presence of a body while that body is not here. The answer is—there is a 'real super local presence.'

Article XXXI says that 'The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and dead to have remission of pain and guilt were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.' The Tract writer finds from the use of the plural 'Masses' that the 'Mass' is not condemned. The Masses were for the most part private and solitary. They were 'blasphemous fables' because they were regarded as sacrifices for sin, other than Christ's death, and they were 'dangerous deceits,' or as the Latin says *per-niciosæ imposturæ*, because they were sold for money. The

Mass itself is a commemorative offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin.

The writer confesses in the conclusion that his explanations are anti-Protestant, while the Articles are admitted to have been drawn up for the establishment of Protestantism. His defence is that it is a duty we owe to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed Confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit. We have no duties towards the framers. By giving Catholic interpretations we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer. The Declaration which confines us to the literal and grammatical sense relieves us from the opinions of the compilers. Moreover such an interpretation is in accordance with the meaning of Melancthon, from whose writings our Articles are principally taken, and whose Catholic tendencies earned for him the respect of popes. The Articles are formed on the principle of leaving large questions open, and the Homilies contain a great variety of doctrines. Lastly, the framers constructed them so as to best comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves.¹

Thirteen days after the publication of this Tract appeared the Letter of the Four Tutors, addressed to the Editor of the 'Tracts for the Times.' They set forth the highly dangerous tendency of the suggestion that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome were not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England, as for instance that they do not contain any condemnation of the doctrine of Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration of Relics, Invocation of Saints, the Mass, as they are taught authoritatively in the

¹ The authors of the Tracts, so far as can be ascertained, are Newman, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 31, 33, 34, 38, 41, 45, 47, 71, 73, 75, 79, 82, 83, 85, 88, 90. No. 8 has by some been ascribed to H. Froude. John Keble, 4, 13, 40, 52, 54, 57, 60, 89; Pusey, 18, 66, 67, 68, 69, 77, 81; Bowden, 5, 29, 30, 56; Thomas Keble, 12, 22, 43, 84; B. Harrison, 16, 17, 24, 49; A. P. Percival, 27, 35, 36; H. Froude, 9, 59, 63; Isaac Williams, 80, 86, 87; Alfred Menzies, 14; C. P. Eden, 32; Newman and Palmer, 15; Unknown, 51. The rest were reprints from Bishops Wilson, Beveridge, Bull, Cosin, and Archbishop Usher, 74, 76, 78, 81. '*Are Catenae*,' the last, was made by B. Harrison, and has prefixed a Tract by Pusey. See Dean Burgon's '*Twelve Good Men*,' vol. i, p. 491, also '*Life of Pusey*,' vol. iii.

Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as the Articles do. Moreover it is urged that the Tract puts forward new and startling views as to the extent to which liberty of subscription may be carried. The subject being so very grave and solemn the Church and the University were entitled to ask that someone besides the printer and publisher should acknowledge himself responsible for the contents of the Tract. Six days after the Tutors' Letter, the Hebdomadal Board of the University passed a resolution disclaiming such modes of interpretation as were suggested in the Tract, evading the sense of the Articles and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract.¹ Newman, in a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, acknowledged the authorship, adhered to the truth and honesty of the principle maintained in the Tract, and the necessity of putting it forth. This necessity was explained by another writer that certain of his followers began to feel themselves obliged to become Roman Catholics, and this Tract was written to enable them to satisfy themselves without leaving the Church of England.

In a letter to the Bishop of Oxford Newman expressed his willingness to withdraw anything which the Bishop might wish to be withdrawn. He explained what seemed to favour Romanism. He had written a letter to Dr Jelf evoked by the action of the four tutors. They had understood the Tract to assert that the Articles did not contain any condemnation of the doctrines of Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics, the Invocation of Saints, and the Mass as they are authoritatively taught by the Church of Rome, but this was not the case. The Church of Rome goes very far to establish another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity, Heaven and Hell, as a popular system, it seemed to preach the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, and Purgatory, but this was not true of the Tridentine decrees, which protested against the same things as much as we do.

¹ The tutors were T. T. Churton, H. B. Wilson, John Griffiths, A. C. Tait. The last became Archbishop of Canterbury and the second was one of the writers in the famous Essays and Reviews.

Wilson in a letter to Churton, in answer to Newman, argued that the four tutors had rightly understood the Tract, so far as it seemed to express the writer's opinions. It would have been intelligible and satisfactory if the Tract had said that the Articles condemned the Romish doctrines which had been authoritatively taught up to that time, and were fastened on the Romish Church by the decrees of Trent. As a matter of fact the Council of Trent left all these doctrines as they found them. It was declared impossible to follow Newman in the shifting of his terms, but it was shown that while he professed that the Articles only condemned the popular doctrines of the Church of Rome, these were found not to be always different from those of Trent. There was added to Wilson's Letter an account of a Franciscan of the name of Davenport known as *Sancta Clara*, who wished in the time of Laud to reconcile England to Rome by a similar explanation of the Articles; but Laud said that the Church of England would never thank him for his exposition. The famous distinction between the 'Romish doctrine' condemned, and some other doctrine not condemned, is found in *Sancta Clara*.

The letter to Dr Jelf was the occasion of a letter to Newman from Dr Wiseman, who described himself as Bishop of Melipotamus. His main point was Newman's distinction between the decrees of Trent and the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome. He quoted the passage about the Blessed Virgin and Purgatory being preached in place of the Trinity, Heaven and Hell, in which popular teaching was identified with authoritative teaching, the doctrine of the Roman schools, and that of the Catechism of Trent. To Wiseman the distinction between authoritative teaching and that of the decrees of Trent was a novel idea. These decrees are the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, just as the XXXIX Articles are the authoritative teaching of the Church of England. It was surprising to Wiseman that Newman should take popular notions as representing authoritative teaching or as identical with the teaching of the Roman schools. Wiseman had gone through the whole course at Rome and had never heard of the Virgin and Saints being prominent objects of regard or that they could be dispensers of mercy. He had heard exactly the contrary

of all which Newman had said was taught in the schools. The same was applicable to the Catechism of Trent. It is a popular exposition and employs the usual language in which Church doctrines are spoken of in the Church, but so far from differing from the Tridentine decrees, it was drawn up and published by the Council. Image worship may be a popular belief and may be practised, but the Church of Rome has, at many times and in many ways, declared against it. Nowhere is it found in authoritative teaching.

Another Roman Catholic under the name simply of an 'English Catholic' wrote to Newman to the same effect. He complained of the misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine, maintaining that the Reformers had no idea of Catholic as distinct from Romish. If any Articles were to condemn the Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls, they would be understood to condemn the doctrine of transmigration, and not merely a form of it known as Pythagorean. So when the English Articles condemn the doctrines of Purgatory, etc., they do not exempt some other doctrines concerning these things which are not Romish. There may be Roman Catholics who believe differently from what the Church of Rome teaches, just as there may be professing Church of England men who maintain doctrines apparently inconsistent with the Articles they have subscribed, but both of them are condemned by the churches to which they belong. The writer assures Newman that his honest countrymen are not to be conjured back into the circle of orthodoxy by any feat of ecclesiastical *legerdemain*.

Facit indignatio versum. Indignation characterised the first outburst of opposition to Tractarianism. The liberal party had scarcely patience to argue the question. Whately described the movement as the New-mania. Julius Hare spoke of Newman's production as rich in ingenious combinations and 'in feats of peculiar logical dexterity.' 'No Chinese juggler' he wrote, 'no Indian tumbler can surpass him. He will whirl round a wheel and then balance himself on his little finger.' Newman quite misunderstood the principles on which the Church of England appealed to the Fathers and the primitive Church. That appeal was strictly 'restorative and regulative' as excluding Romish additions.

Newman made it positive and directive, as repressive of private judgment and enjoining the teaching of all which the early church taught.

Thomas Arnold, another liberal theologian, was the most unadulterated enemy of the Tractarians, and he was the man whom they most hated. He speaks of those who make the Church to depend on an apostolical succession as 'extraordinary persons.' They really suppose that Episcopacy as it exists at the present time is the same as Episcopacy in the primitive Church. To believe as Newman and Keble said, that no one is safe who does not belong to an Episcopal Church is not to follow God's seal unless countersigned by one of our own forging.¹ All sects have had among them the marks of Christ's Church in the graces of the Spirit and the confession of His name. In all times and in all countries, there has been a succession of men enjoying the blessings and showing forth the fruits of Christ's spirit. The Tractarian idea of the Church and the sacraments is idolatry. It makes the Church and not Christ the mediator between God and man. The whole system is in complete opposition to the Christianity of the New Testament, as very a *truncus ficulnus* as even the most degraded heathen ever worshipped.² Arnold went on to say that he could as soon worship Jupiter as believe in the Holy Catholic Church as some understand it. The whole spirit and tone of the party were offensive to his intellectual and his moral sense. What Pusey denounced as Rationalism, Arnold extolled as that knowledge, judgment and understanding which are commended in the Scriptures. Newman, Pusey and their followers hated the nineteenth century. They hated progress, and wishing to find something quite opposite, they turned to what is called Christian antiquity. But alas for their representation of Christian antiquity. It was a mere caricature. Had they understood the good as well as the evil of the nineteenth century, they would have turned not to the Church of Cyprian, Athanasius and Augustine but to that of St Paul and St John.³ This is an age when men must reason. They can no longer, as

¹ Stanley's Life, p. 300.

² Ibid 381.

³ Introduction to Sermons.

Newman and Pusey demand, submit to authority and believe whatever is told them.

Arnold contrasts the Oxford movement with that led by Simeon at Cambridge. In the latter, men were taught to turn from sin to righteousness. The subject of preaching was Christ crucified ; but the Oxford men preach the Church, that is the clergy, that is they preach themselves. Their system had been tried and had failed. The evil of the eighteenth century was a reaction caused by its failure. The Church is not to be identified with the clergy. It is the people, and faith is something more than mere submission.

Of the many answers to the Tractarian writers the work of William Goode may be taken as the most complete.¹ The words of Irenæus describing heretics of his time, are used as a motto, 'Heretics when refuted from the Scriptures, turn against the Scriptures themselves, because of the discrepancies and because truth cannot be found from them by those who are ignorant of tradition, for that is not handed down by writings but by the living voice.' The first diverging line between the Tractarians and our Reformers is in the use of the word Catholic. The latter identified it with Protestant, so that Protestantism was Catholicism, or in the words of Bishop Jewel 'the ancient religion restored.' The Tractarians make 'the ancient religion more like the Roman Catholic than the Protestant,'² relying on what they call 'Catholic consent' or the general agreement on essential doctrines in the early Church. Goode produces a host of passages from the Fathers to prove that no such Catholic consent ever existed. It is agreed among all parties of Christians that the Scriptures are

¹ The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, or a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine that Holy Scripture has been, since the times of the Apostles, the Sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice to the Church against the dangerous errors of the Authors of the Tracts for the Times and the Romanists, as particularly that the Rule of Faith is 'made up of Scripture and Tradition together,' in which also the Doctrines of the Apostolical Succession, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, etc., are fully discussed. By William Goode, in three volumes ; first edition 1842, second edition 1853.

² The book was reviewed by Ward in the 'British Critic' and heartily abused as worthless, not even likely to pay the expenses of publication. Ward soon after passed over to the Church of Rome and confessed that he knew but little of the Fathers.

divine, and therefore a rule of faith. It is also agreed that what the Apostles taught was first spoken and afterwards written. The inquiry then is if we have any record or witness of the oral teaching such as could authorise us to receive it as a divine revelation, either as a supplement to their writings or an interpretation of them. This record or witness is called Tradition, sometimes Apostolic Tradition. Some in the Church of Rome have maintained an oral as well as a written tradition, but the Tractarians look only to the written, that which is found in the Fathers, so their tradition is what may be called 'patristical,' or the 'patristical report of oral apostolical tradition.' It is here to be remembered that the Fathers often speak of tradition when they simply mean what is handed down in the Scriptures. They call that which is in the Evangelists 'Evangelical Tradition,' and that in the apostolic epistles 'Apostolical Tradition.' It is also to be remembered that any tradition found in the Fathers is never by them claimed to be derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles. It is admitted that the agreement of many of the Fathers on any one point is a strong argument in its favour, but they are only fallible, while the force of the tradition argument is in the previous assumption of the infallibility of the primitive church.

The Canonical Scriptures are the only writings which can be called Apostolical Tradition. This claim was set up for the Apostles' Creed as having been written by the Apostles. Newman even believed that St Paul referred to it when he spoke of the 'form *or outline* of sound words.' This was easily refuted. The patristical tradition was also found untenable, not only on the ground that the Fathers were not infallible, but because the writings of the Primitive Fathers which remain are not a sufficient representation of the whole Church, and because they do not agree even in fundamental points. As to the Trinity, for example, we have more or less every heresy on the Trinity in some of their writings. Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, could all appeal, and not in vain, to the Fathers who were before them. There is no Catholic consent in the first three centuries of Christianity as to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. It is not to be expected that such a consent is to be found in the writings which remain to us. Even that

small and partial consent which is attainable and is called Catholic consent is embarrassed with uncertainties and difficulties. In many cases the expressions used are uncertain, of doubtful meaning, and open to different, even opposite interpretations. The language is often loose, inaccurate and rhetorical. The writers who preceded the fourth century had not before them the controversies which came later, and so we do not find in them any more verbally definite sentences than we find in the Scriptures.

The value of the consent which may be found in the writings that remain to us is much reduced by the fact of rival appeals to tradition grounded upon testimonies, many of which we do not now possess. The Nestorians persistently maintained that their doctrines were handed down from the earliest times. The followers of Artemon who denied Christ's divinity claimed all the ancients and the Apostles themselves as in favour of their views. Eutyches at the Council of Constantinople appealed to the 'blessed Cyril, the holy Fathers and the holy Athanasius, against the two natures.' The monks who agreed with him at the Fourth Council of Ephesus said, 'We are all of the same mind both with those who met at Nicæa and the holy Fathers who were assembled here at the third General Council. As to some things concerning which we seem to have Catholic consent, the Tractarians are quite indifferent. It seems certain that in the Primitive Church the people stood at prayer on Sunday. The testimony of Justin Martyr is that 'the custom commenced from apostolic times as the blessed Irenæus, Martyr and Bishop of Lyons, saith.' We have also the words of Tertullian : 'We account it a crime to kneel at prayer on Sunday,' and the First Council of Nicæa, referring to those who kneel on Sunday, decreed that 'they should offer their prayers to God standing.'

It was a doctrine of the Tractarians that but for tradition we could not know the Scriptures to be the Word of God. This is denied, and the usual arguments for the genuineness, authority and inspiration of the Scriptures are brought forward, especially the testimony of the Spirit of God in the Scriptures to the human heart. That Holy Scripture is our sole rule is proved by the testimony of many Fathers. St

Ambrose, to give but one of the many testimonies, says, 'Let us interrogate the Scriptures, let us interrogate the Apostles, let us interrogate the Prophets, let us interrogate Christ.' It is shown that the Scriptures are a sufficient ground for all the articles of faith professed by the Church of England, and not for them only, but for some things that may be called rites and ceremonies, as infant baptism, observance of Sunday, episcopal government.

That the Fathers regarded Holy Scripture as the only rule of faith is shown at large. They knew nothing of 'Catholic consent' supplementary to the Scripture, or as an interpretation of Scripture. Justin Martyr, speaking of those who denied the divinity of Christ, said, 'We are commanded by Christ Himself to be ruled, not by the doctrines of men, but those preached by the blessed prophets and taught by Him.' Origen refers to 'the most true rule of the Scriptures,' and the doctrine agreeable to it. Augustine takes the Scriptures as unerrable, but as for other authors, he did not take anything they said as certainly true.

Testimonies from the writings of the Saints may be brought forward, but their authority is not to be 'put by us on a level' with the Scriptures. The immediate disciples of the Apostles might be expected to refer to the oral teaching of their masters as authoritative and as the Word of God, as well as their writings. But any reference by them to the authority of the Scriptures became on this account of more value. Ignatius says of some that they would only believe what they read in the original, otherwise they would not believe it 'to be written in the Gospel.' The great question even at this time was 'Is it written?' Polycarp wrote to the Philippian, 'I trust that you are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures and nothing is hid from you.' On what Irenæus said of heretics appealing to tradition when Scripture was against them, Erasmus wrote, 'Irenæus fights against a host of heretics with the sole aid of the Scriptures.' Tertullian says of every doctrine, 'Nothing is certain respecting it because the Scripture does not declare it.' Again, 'If it is not written, let him fear that woe which is destined for them who add to or take from the Scriptures.' Even after he became a Montanist and believed in the revelations of Prisca and others

of that sect, he considered the 'new prophecy' as concerning only 'improvements in the discipline of the Church.' The testimony of Clement of Alexandria may seem to be on the other side. He had a doctrine of tradition peculiar to himself. He called it a Gnostic Tradition, given only to gnostics, that is, perfect Christians. This was a kind of private tradition committed by Jesus to His more favoured apostles. The Carpocratians had a similar belief. They said that Jesus Christ spoke some things privately in a mysterious manner to His disciples and apostles, and commanded to deliver those things to them that were worthy and obedient. Clement added the 'Gnostic Tradition' to Scripture as together constituting the rule of faith. Lactantius described the faith as 'that which is contained in the divine Scriptures.' Athanasius referred to Scripture as the 'source' of truth, more 'exact' than any other, and the Council of Nicæa decreed to 'banish hostile contention, and take the solution of the points in question from the words of divine inspiration.' These are but a few excerpts from the many passages quoted by Goode. Many more are added, and those which seem to say that there is another rule of faith besides the Scriptures, so modify this testimony that for all practical purposes it is neutralised.

Then follow the testimonies of the principal divines of the Church of England. The canon of 1571 is first considered. It is the chief Anglican authoritative document for the principle of tradition. That canon says that nothing is to be taught 'except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.' It is not usual to quote the rest of the canon which goes on to say that 'the clergy shall not teach vain and senseless opinions and heresies and Popish errors.' The object of the canon is to support the Reformed doctrine by the authority of the Fathers. According to Bishop Patrick it was intended 'to preserve preachers from broaching any idle, novel or Popish doctrine.' Waterland says, 'It does not order that they shall teach whatever has been taught by the Fathers,' nor 'whatsoever the Fathers had collected from Scripture,' but 'the doctrine must be first proved in Scripture.' It is enough to quote a few of the testimonies from the principal divines. Jewel says that 'in

all controversy' we are to 'remit judgment unto God's Word.' Hooker adduced the authority of St Paul for esteeming Scripture 'as the supreme rule whereby all other doctrines must for ever be examined.' Bishop Hare says 'As for traditions which they do lift up to an unjust competition with the written Word, our Saviour hath before humbled them unto the dust.' Archbishop Laud wrote 'You have been often enough told that if you will show us such unwritten Word of God delivered by the prophets and apostles we will acknowledge it to be divine, infallible.' Thomas Jackson calls 'the making of ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the canon of faith,' one of the additions made by the Roman Church.

A Nonconformist writer who had given some attention to the study of Christian antiquity, gave his judgment on the Oxford movement and its relation to the Primitive Church.¹ He admitted that the appeal from the alleged authority of the Romish Church to a Catholicity more Catholic and an antiquity more ancient was perfectly legitimate. The external defence was good, but embarrassments came from within. The pristine Church was not so pure as by many it is supposed to have been. The Tract writers were staking the very existence of the English Church on notions of ancient Christianity which will not bear examination.

It is proposed to lay open the whole condition, moral, spiritual and ecclesiastical of the ancient Church. The writer assumes that the English Reformers had in view a return to the Ante-Nicene Church, the practical influence of which had been evil. The Evangelical clergy may contend with the Tractarians, but not as Churchmen. There is no agreement between the Evangelical leaders and the Fathers of the Nicene age. Some deference is due to the mind and testimony of the ancient Catholic Church, but the Tract writers have not determined the limits of this deference. They have followed Christian antiquity with a credulous veneration, forgetful of the apostolic predictions concerning the early apostasy. They are like men who persist in sleeping in the Campagna, after having been warned that the whole region

¹ See *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts*, 1844, fourth edition, (Isaac Taylor).

exhales a malignant miasma. The first five, or even the first three, centuries comprise samples of every variety of intellectual or moral aberration of which the human mind under the influence of religious excitement is susceptible. The notions prevailing in the early Church were so false and pernicious that if the Tract writers and their followers had then been at Carthage, Alexandria, Rome or Antioch, they would have been glad to make their escape towards our own time and country, and we should never have heard another word about 'venerable antiquity,' or 'the Holy Catholic Church of the first ages.'

The writer dwells mainly on religious celibacy and how it affected every other element. It came from Gnosticism which the Fathers refuted, and yet by Gnosticism they were powerfully influenced in every branch of doctrine, and in the whole ecclesiastical constitution. This heresy sprang from oriental theosophy. It regarded the material world as too vile to be the work of the 'Unknown Father,' the author of all good. It was the work of inferior gods, and the Christ or Logos came to deliver it. The same doctrine is found in many Fathers, as for instance in Gregory Nyssen, who says that 'the only approach to the Deity is in the path of abstraction from the affections of humanity as connected with our animal and social state, and that the institution of virginity has this very end in view that we may the more effectually withdraw ourselves from the entanglements of mundane existence.' Some of the Fathers make the object of the descent of the Logos into our world to be the abrogation of the original sexual constitution and the institution of a more spiritual economy. The oriental poison was received that virginity rendered a man like to the incorruptible God.

The conclusion is that the English and Nicene Churches may be allied by half-a-dozen ambiguous phrases, but they are substantially and immeasurably different. If the Anglican is to appeal to a higher antiquity than the Romish, he must submit to it fully and openly. To reject certain parts and to retain others is to fall back on the Protestant principle of private judgment. Gnosticism supplied the principle of the Church of Rome and Polytheism its ritual. We may condemn the Church of Rome, but the same condemnation

involves also the Nicene Church, for the difference is in circumstantialia, not in substance.

The Tracts were answered on the Roman Catholic side by three articles in the *Dublin Review* by Dr Wiseman.¹ The argument culminated in the third, which traced a complete parallel between the position of the Donatists of Africa and that of the Tract writers. The Church of England under Elizabeth was a new Church. The Bishops who held the Sees under Mary were deprived not by any law of the Church but solely by the civil power. Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff was the only Bishop in office who took the oath of supremacy to Elizabeth. By the deprivation of these bishops the Church of England put itself in a state of schism. It had no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and so no power to connect the new hierarchy with the old one. The metropolitan See was vacant. The bishops who refused to take the oath of supremacy refused to consecrate. The consecration of the new Archbishop was performed by four Protestant Bishops who had been deprived under Mary, and were at this time out of office. They had no connection with the Church Catholic, and represented nobody but the Queen, who undertook to make good by her own right whatever was deficient in their authority. Augustine as if by anticipation, had answered the Tractarians. He wrote, 'You are with us in baptism, in the creed, in the other sacraments of the Lord, but in the spirit of unity, in the bond of peace, in the Catholic faith you are not with us.'

The Donatists began with the predecessor of Donatus, Majorinus who had been consecrated in the place of Cæcilianus because this Cæcilianus was a Traditor, that is one who had given up the sacred books in the time of the Diocletian persecution. Seventy bishops assembled in Carthage with the Primate of Numidia at their head, refused to communicate with him. By their authority Majorinus was consecrated in his place. Here began a national church in separation from the Catholic. The majority adhered to it, not many remained in communion with the deprived Bishop Cæcilianus, but these were in communion with the Catholic Church throughout the world, while the Donatists were only in Africa. This was the

¹ 1836, F. G.

counterpart of the Anglican position. The Donatists objected to their name and claimed that of Catholic, by the usual Protestant argument that every true Christian is a Catholic, and they called the other party by the name of Cæcilianists, just as now Catholics are called Romanists or Papists.

The Fathers argued against these Donatists that they were schismatics and outside the pale of the Church Catholic. The very fact that they were merely a national Church, not holding communion with the churches in other lands, was clear evidence of their being in a state of schism. They could not be the whole Catholic Church for they were only in Africa. They could not even be a part of the true Church, for the Church is one and not divided. St Augustine with patristic logic and patristic interpretation of Scripture proved that the Church was one, for in Abraham's seed all nations were to be blessed; the Messiah was to have the nations for His heritage and to rule from sea to sea.

The Donatists defended their separation on the ground of the corruptions of the Catholic Church. This was and is the common plea of schismatics. The Churches in other lands had also been *Traditores*, and so the whole world was contaminated. The Book of Homilies, in like manner, spoke of the corruptions of the Church before the Reformation. But St Augustine answered them both by showing from Christ's promises that the Church should never fail. This Church consists of the aggregate churches of all lands, and any one out of communion with them is in schism. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum*, 'The entire world judges safely that they are not good who separate themselves from the entire world.'

There are yet other points of parallel between the Donatists and the Anglicans. They both soon divided up into sects, each claiming that it alone had a true baptism or true doctrine. Augustine said to the Donatists 'You have no difficulty in deciding that these different sects seceded from you and not you from them.' Primitive Donatism saw different sects prevailing in different provinces, Rogatenses in Mauritania, Urbanenses in Numidia, and so forth, just as in England in some counties Methodists prevail, in others Quakers, and in some districts it may be Unitarians. The Anglican Church

can point out the sects that have separated from it in England, and so the Catholic Church those who have separated in any part of the world. It is one, and cannot embrace a multitude of heterogeneous churches, like the unity of the Tract writers, who make a Catholic Church of those whose faith is as different as Greek, Syrian, Anglican, and those of Rome. Cresconius, a Donatist, while claiming communion with the Catholic world said that the East did not communicate with Africa, nor Africa with the East, to which Augustine answered that the East did not communicate with the chaff of Africa, that is the Donatists, but with the Catholic wheat over the whole world. The Catholics in Africa might be few, but they had active communion with the whole Church. So with the few Catholics in England; while the National Church was only in England, Catholic bishops had letters of communion when they travelled in foreign countries, but what Church would receive such letters from an Anglican bishop? Not one in Europe, China, India, Syria.

Another evidence of Catholicity to which the Tractarians do not even pretend is communion with the Church of St Peter. St Optatus proves the Donatists to be Schismatics because they were separated from the Roman See. The English Church in 1534 disowning all connection with the Church of Rome, from that moment ceased to communicate with it. It thus ceased at the same time to communicate with the whole Catholic world. The Fathers in their defences of the unity of the Church as the aggregate of Churches throughout the world, did not admit the possibility of any case that could justify such separation.

Once more, as among the Anglicans, so among the Donatists there sprang up a High Church party. The leader of it was Tichonius who demonstrated the absurdity of excluding numerous churches dispersed all over the world from being the true Church, yet he was blind to the fact that his own Church was in schism, and that it was his duty as an individual to become a Catholic. It was not necessary to name the leader of the Tractarians who answered to this Tichonius. It was enough to mention the Faussets and Shuttleworths of our day who had their counterparts among the fellow churchmen of Tichonius, and maintained that his principles,

pushed to their legitimate consequences, would necessarily lead to the abandoning of Africanism and the embracing of Catholicity. Donatists called Catholic bishops intruders as Anglicans do now. They allowed themselves to be called Africans or the African Church, just as Tractarians are called Anglicans and the Anglican Church. The Donatists were severe against the sects that separated from them just as the Tractarians are against the Dissenters. The Donatists denounced the Maximianists for their separation, as the Tract Writers denounce Wesleyans and Quakers. They see the mote of schism that is in the Dissenters' eye, but not the beam that is in the eye of the Anglican.¹

Another branch of the Tractarian question was discussed in a subsequent article² attributed to Dr Lingard. The title was 'Did the Anglican Church reform itself?' The position controverted was that of William Palmer in his 'Treatise on the Christian Church,' and of Dr Hook in his famous sermon before the Queen.³ Hitherto it was the received opinion that the Church of England had been reformed by the State. The old bishops of Mary's time were deprived when Elizabeth came to the throne, the new installed, the Mass abolished, and the Liturgy substituted by the authority of the civil power. But now on this subject from Oxford has come new light. The illusion of the past is dispelled, and it is found that the civil authority did not reform the Church, but simply enabled the Church to reform itself. Thus to use the favourite simile of Dr Hook, 'it was the same Church with its face washed.' She had been before the Reformation the daughter of the 'Scarlet Lady,' 'the foul, filthy old withered harlot,' as the Homilies call the Church of Rome, but now she is washed and made clean.

The Tractarians admit that there was a true Catholic and Apostolic Church in England before the Reformation. Now

¹ Bishop Thirlwall was once impudently charged with being one of those who hounded Dr Newman out of the Church of England, but he was not hounded, he was ferreted, and this was not done by Thirlwall but by Wiseman who unearthed Newman in his last resource, and proved him to be the precise parallel of Tichonius, the leader of the High Church party in the National Church of Africa. See Thirlwall's Remains, vol. ii, p. 353.

² 1840.

³ 1838.

there is a Protestant National Church. It is true that the name Protestant is repudiated by the Tract writers, but the law of the land declares that the Head of the English Church must be Protestant. Can a Church be different from its Head?

William Palmer said that 'the bishops and clergy of all England and Ireland determined that the Roman Patriarch had no jurisdiction in these realms.' The Church of England had once delegated jurisdiction to the Church of Rome, but it was now withdrawn. Against this statement are adduced the simple facts of history. The first act in the drama of the Reformation was the recognition of the royal supremacy. The King caused informations to be filed against Cardinal Wolsey for the acceptance and exercise of legantine power, and against the clergy as abettors of Wolsey, though he had placed them under the necessity of obeying Wolsey's authority. The King compelled Convocation to pass an act that he and he alone was supreme Head of the Church of England. Such an act was passed with the saving clause 'so far as is allowed by the law of Christ.' This was not to the King's liking, but it passed. Two years later came the severance of all communication with the Papal See. This was the work of the civil power, and apparently without even any consultation with Convocation. Parliament passed an act declaring the King supreme Head of the Church of England, and omitting the saving clause inserted by the clergy. Then followed a royal injunction to the archbishops and bishops to abstain from the exercise of all episcopal functions till the King, that is the King as represented by Thomas Cromwell, had made a visitation of the dioceses. In the Convocation of 1536, the delegate of Cromwell, vicegerent of the King, claimed the first place.

During the reign of Edward, Cranmer was supreme. He now commanded when he seemed only to obey. What the bishops would have rejected, he enjoined in the name of the sovereign. In his name came injunctions about 'images, ceremonies, holidays and church services.' Men of the 'new learning' were put into all vacant benefices and bishoprics. Then came a new Liturgy, a new ordinal, new Articles of doctrine, and if the king had lived, there would have been a new code of canon law. The government of the Church, as far

as the supremacy of the Pope was concerned, was changed. The worship, the doctrine were changed, and yet the Tract writers say it was the same Church at the end of Edward's reign which it had been at the beginning of Henry's, though the difference was precisely the same as between the present Church of England and the Church of Rome.

Mary restored the old Church which was identical with that at the beginning of Henry's time, but not with that of Edward's. Elizabeth repealed the acts of former Parliaments and established new ones, not with the approbation but rather in defiance of the Church. Every bishop protested—the whole Convocation protested. Even the House of Lords only passed the Act for the Book of Common Prayer by a majority of three, and to get this majority two bishops had been imprisoned, and four commoners of Reformed principles had been raised to the peerage. These enactments were the basis of the present Church of England, yet the Tract writers say the Church of England reformed itself.

The Romeward tendency of the Tractarian movement was first clearly manifested in Richard Hurrell Froude,¹ Newman's earliest Oxford friend and fellow-labourer. The editors of his 'Remains'² speak of 'the keen courageous searching precision' with which he set forth his ecclesiastical and theological opinions.³ He was certainly clear and decided, evincing both earnestness and candour. He lived an ascetic life, chastising himself as he expressed it, 'before the Lord,' and he died early. At one time the floor was his nightly bed, and often his fast was not broken till the day began to wear away. He 'adored' Charles I and Archbishop Laud, hated Milton, disliked Wycliffe, and 'admired' Cardinal Pole. The Puritans were his special aversion, but he was somewhat reconciled to them when he found that they maintained a *jus divinum* for Church polity, though their polity was of the wrong kind. They looked for a divine institution in the Bible to the neglect of history and found nothing better than the Geneva 'platform.' But even this was better than the belief of the Reforming bishops who looked on ordination as emanating from the Queen. Though the Puritans were on

¹ B. 1803, d. 1836.

² 1838.

³ The Preface was written by Keble.

the wrong track, they wished to be right. It was not till Saravia and Bancroft claimed a *jus divinum* for Episcopacy that the Church of England again began to assert her identity with the ancient Church.

The Reformation was the grand historical obstacle in the way of the Oxford movement. It was 'a limb badly set and must be broken again in order to be righted.' Some had spoken in praise of Ridley, but he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, and that was enough for his condemnation. Bishop Jewel was what in our day would be called 'an irreverent Dissenter.' He abused the Mass and laughed at apostolic succession both as a principle and as a fact. He did not allow the Lord's Supper to be a means of grace different from other divine ordinances. Instruction and conviction binding the consciences of men were the only keys to the kingdom of heaven. He ridiculed the consecration of the elements in the Eucharist, and he taught that Christ's body and blood were only received by way of remembrance. To disconnect us from the erring Reformers was the object of the preface which Laud caused to be prefixed to the Articles of Religion.

Froude vowed that never again would he call 'the Holy Eucharist' the Lord's Supper, nor 'God's priests' ministers of the Word, nor the 'altar' a table, and never would he abuse the Roman Catholic Church except for its excommunicating him as an Anglican heretic.

The High Church party, it was added, cut the ground from their feet by acknowledging Tillotson, but Convocation died a noble death in its conflict with that terrible heresiarch, Bishop Hoadly. This was the work of the Lower House, that is the High Churchmen who fought with the Socinianising bishops. There were writers who had tried to defend the Reformers, denying that they were Zwinglians and Erastians. It was much to be wished that this could have been proved, but the evidence to the contrary is too strong. They were Protestants of the very worst kind. The Church of England is clear of them. It is in no way bound to the opinions of any man or of any school. Froude anticipated Newman's principle of a 'Catholic' interpretation of the Articles. They were to be brought into harmony with the tone and spirit of the

ancient Church. This was Laud's object in requiring that they should only be taken in the 'literal and grammatical sense' without reference to the views of those who framed them.

Froude disparaged preaching, that he might exalt the Sacraments. The clergy had power to make the Eucharistic bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This power was given them at their ordination by the successors of the Apostles. Episcopacy is not merely an apostolic institution. It is an essential of the Church. Charles and Laud, the martyred prince and prelate did not die for a point of discipline. To them Episcopacy was no more a mere form than was the death of Christ. The Church of England is Catholic without Popery and without Protestantism. It is opposed to Rationalism of every kind, whether that of the Methodists represented by Adam Clarke who maintained that his conversion was evidence of the truth of Scripture, being the work of the same Spirit of God, or whether that represented by the Zwinglian or Socinian Bishop Hoadly, who found no more grace in the Sacraments than what results from the natural tendency of a religious ordinance.

Among Newman's disciples the leader in the Roman direction was William George Ward who wrote the 'Ideal of the Christian Church.'¹ The ideal might have been elaborated out of the author's own consciousness, if there had been no Roman Catholic Church to present a picture to be copied. The ideal Church is to settle all problems about science and difficulties arising from Biblical criticism, and it is to convert Protestant and infidel philosophers. The discourse left scope for passing a judgment on historical events. The English Reformation was not like the foreign Reformation which perverted moral feeling, and taught the hateful heresy of justification by faith. The foreign however is preferred to the English, because Luther's indignation was single-minded and honest, while the English was mainly political. These words follow 'I know of no single movement in the Church except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims to our sympathy and regard as the English Reformation.' The English Church was 'the schism of the sixteenth century.' It is arrogant, self-

¹ 2nd edition, 1844

contented, and self-complacent, frustrating the efforts of all her faithful children to raise her from degradation. It does not allow honour to St Mary, nor does it regard the Roman Church with reverence and affection. It does not agree with the Church of the first four centuries. It is not independent of the State, and no bishop nor even all the bishops can add a single prayer to the Liturgy.

In a multitude of other respects the English Church is unlike the primitive. It does not confirm nor administer the Eucharist immediately after Baptism. It uses no unction either in Baptism or Confirmation. It has no exorcism and it does not carry the Host to the sick and the dying. It has no prayers for the dead, no public penance, no fasting communion, no minor orders before priesthood, and no celibacy of the clergy. It holds English Catholics to be in schism, so that a priest saying Mass at Calais is a Catholic, but crossing to Dover he becomes a Schismatic. The contrasts which Ward makes between the Church of England and his 'ideal' Church are yet very plentiful. It is enough to say that they embrace every point on which the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome. The remedy is a sustained and vigorous attack on the principles of the Reformation, a carrying out of the principles which the Reformation denied—obedience and faith. It is added 'Never within these three centuries has there been so lively a counter movement, at least in England, as there is now.'

The theological part of the 'Ideal' was founded on the Agnostic philosophy of John Stuart Mill that the intellect can attain to no assurance of religious truth. It cannot even prove the existence of God. Reason is not sufficient to refute either the Socinians or the Latitudinarians. Religion founded merely on emotion leads to enthusiasm. What is left then is conscience, what Kant called the 'categorical imperative.' There is something to be obeyed. Our attitude must be that of the learner. We must follow those whose obedience has been more complete than our own, and these are found in the Roman Catholic Church. This is faith. The 'Ideal' was a firebrand rudely thrown by a friendly hand into the Tractarians' camp. The materials were combustible

and the conflagration was great. William Ewart Gladstone reviewed the 'Ideal,' showing it but little mercy. On the subject of the English Reformation, Ward was reminded of an Athenian law, by which in certain cases, the accuser failing in his proof lost his head. Though ignorant of history, the deficiency might have been supplied by his learned leisure at Oxford. The 'Ideal' was remarkable for 'the triviality of its investigation combined with the savageness of its censures.' If by the Reformers 'more political than religious,' Ward meant those of King Henry's time, then the censure fell on the heads of Warham, Gardiner, and Tunstal more than on Cranmer. It certainly could not be applied to the Reformers of Queen Elizabeth's time.

Ward might be called the most pronounced Tractarian leader in the Romeward direction. He came up to Oxford a disciple of Bentham and Mill, passed over to the school of Arnold, was converted by Newman, and showed Newman that the goal to which he was unconsciously tending was the Church of Rome. Ward knew nothing of history, and openly declared that he had no interest in it, but looking at the Articles in the light of unprejudiced reason, he could see that they were Protestant, and that while Newman might think of their bearing a Catholic sense, such a sense was 'non-natural.' When he signed them as deacon, it was with scruples on the Arnoldian side, and when as priest, with scruples on the Newmanian side. He now embraced all Romanist doctrines, and told the Tractarians that their object would never be attained till they undid the work of the Reformation. That was 'a miserable event' effected by men without principle, of no decided religious views, and guided merely by selfish and political interests. For the last three hundred years the Church of England had had no external notes of being a Church.

A famous Article² on Bishop Jewel in the *British Critic*, shows the advanced position of the Romeward party in their estimation of the English Reformation. It is on the lines suggested in Froude's Remains and cannot be accused of either ambiguity or indefiniteness as to its meaning and pur-

¹ *Quarterly Review*, December 1844.

² Vol. XXX, by Frederick Oakley who afterwards became a Roman Catholic.

pose. The Reformation was a 'penalty, a fearful judgment' on the Church for having suffered the seeds of fatal disease to sink so deep into her constitution. The remedy was desperate. Visible unity with Rome may not be the essence of a Church, but to be without it is to forego a privilege, not to assert a right. Rome is an elder sister in the faith, she is our Mother, to whom, by the grace of God, we owe it that we are what we are.

After this exordium not much is to be expected for Bishop Jewel. He was the champion of Protestantism, the unmitigated enemy of the Church which had the 'fatal disease.' He turned everything to controversy and 'his work was like nouns defective in all cases except the accusative.'

The reign of Edward VI was the downward course of the English Reformation. It was providentially checked by the accession of Mary. We do not owe much to the English Reformers. The more we read their writings, the less we admire them. When Catholic principles are better understood, their hold on the minds of many Christians will be loosened. Their works, in fact, are only literary curiosities. They are not contributions to theological literature.

At the hands of this writer the Reformers fare worse than their works. Those of them who suffered what we call martyrdom were not martyrs. They died for their heresies and not for the truth. Bishop Jewel was found guilty of calling all the ecclesiastical vestments, even including the surplice, 'Papal rubbish.' Some writers make a strong line of demarcation between the Reformation in England and that on the Continent. They wish to clear our Reformers from any suspicion of agreement with those of Germany or Switzerland. But this distinction cannot be made good. It was not due to our Reformers but to the providence of God that 'England presents a more faithful image of Catholicism' than is to be found in the Protestant communions of other lands. Our Liturgy is Catholic, and though our Articles have an uncatholic spirit, their language does not directly contradict the Catholic doctrine. It is true that for a long time the Church of England was little influenced by the efforts of those who tried to elevate it. Protestantism, 'character-

istically the religion of corrupt human nature,' had done its work. Still hope never died. Men believed in the 'power and tenacity of the principles of Catholicism,' and that they would yet reassert themselves. Catholic antiquity and the English Reformation are not only 'diverging but opposed.' Our business now is to get over the Reformation 'since we have seen that the Protestant tone of thought and doctrine is essentially anti-Christian.' It was Queen Elizabeth and not her bishops who saved the Church of England from identification with the foreign Protestant communities.

It is found that Jewel was the disciple of Peter Martyr. He had close and confidential intercourse with Bullinger, Zwingle, and the rest of the Protestant congregation at Zurich. After his return to England, he referred questions to them and asked their advice. So great was his affection for Peter Martyr that he longed again to have with him that converse which once they had together at Zurich, and he writes to him, 'We have exhibited to the Queen our Articles of Religion and Doctrine, and in little have we departed from the Confession of Zurich.'

The writer goes on to show that it is not fair to charge all the Protestantism of the Church of England on the foreign Reformers. Their 'beneficial influence' was never repudiated. They were in constant correspondence with Jewel, who stood high in the confidence of Archbishop Parker. The famous 'Apology' takes the common Protestant ground against the Church of Rome, and has not a word of distinction between the Church of England and other Reformed Churches. This 'Apology' was approved by Parker who wished to make it of quasi-authority in the Church of England. It was the delight also of the Continental Reformers.

In the 'Apology' and the 'Defence of the Apology' it was found that Jewel not only denied the apostolic succession of bishops, but often quoted in this connection the words of St Paul 'after my departure ravening wolves shall enter.' He called the Sacraments signs 'without one hint of the mysterious virtue, the transforming invigorating efficacy which the natural elements acquire through the act of con-

secration.' He even spoke of Becket's ambition and vanity, 'thus slandering the saint of the Most High.'

In no connection with this article, but closely following it, was one called 'The Anglican Church *in* the Mediterranean.' With the old moorings of the Reformation left and the Reformers thrown overboard, the Church of England did seem 'in the Mediterranean,' or some other sea.

An article¹ in the following year called the 'Development of the Church in the Seventeenth Century,' might be reckoned a continuation of that on Bishop Jewel. It apologised for the divines of that age being so much occupied in the refutation of Popery. That was, or appeared to be, the enemy then, but had they lived now they would have been otherwise employed. They would have found in Dissent a worse enemy than Popery. Protestantism on the Continent had developed into a mischievous system, compared with which the corruptions of Rome were as dust in the balance. There were some who denied or minimised the foreign influence on our Reformers, but the fact was too notorious to admit of dispute. The often repeated story of Peter Heylin that Cranmer was offered the help of Calvin and refused it, is set aside as not likely to be true. Heylin himself testifies that the alterations in the second Prayer Book were due to the influence of that 'Polypragmon.' It is well known that Cranmer brought some of the leading Continental Reformers to England. He gave Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer Divinity Chairs at Oxford and Cambridge. He was deeply engaged in correspondence with Calvin. These things are no more to be disputed than that the Goths sacked Rome and that William the Conqueror invaded England.

The Puritan feeling against ecclesiastical vestments was introduced by the Reformers, though it may not have originated with them. Many were retained in the first book, but through foreign influence all disappeared except the surplice for the priest and the rochet for the bishop. Even for what they retained the bishops did not stand out on principle. They compelled Hooper to be a bishop though he refused to wear the rochet, and the matter was settled by compromise

¹ Development of the Church in the Seventeenth Century, vol. xxxi.

that he was to wear it on particular occasions. They made 'an obstinate Puritan, a mere dogged Geneva preacher, of all things, a bishop.' Another Puritan and Genevan of the same stamp was Miles Coverdale, who at the consecration of Parker officiated in his black gown. Even Ridley advised the exiles at Frankfort to discontinue the use of the surplice.

The bishops in the first part of Elizabeth's reign were successors of Hooper and Coverdale, more than of Cranmer and Ridley. The greater part of them objected to the surplice as Sandys, Grindal, Pilkington, Jewel, Parkhurst. They were all for simplifying the Church ceremonial according to the Geneva model. It was only the strong Tudor arm of Elizabeth that kept them within decent bounds. Parker alone stood by the Queen in her determination to uphold the ceremonies.

But there was something even worse than the rejection of the ceremonies. The whole Church from one end to the other was flooded with the peculiar doctrines of Calvin. The five points gained possession of both Universities. Calvinism was the recognised doctrine of our divinity schools. Oxford was the very focus of Genevan influence. The doctors and professors were Calvinistic preachers. The colleges and halls were seminaries for teaching election and reprobation. The exiles who returned upon the death of Mary deeply imbued with the Geneva doctrines were everywhere triumphant. They monopolised the bishoprics, deaneries, canonries, and all the best benefices of the Church. The world groaned under the weight of Calvinism. Heylin made a great effort to maintain the contrary, and spoke of the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, but the Lambeth Articles constructed by Whitgift with the leading bishops and divines testify against him.

The Church was rapidly becoming, if it had not yet become, a mere Calvinistic sect. The churches were turned into conventicles. The communion tables were in the centre of the building. The clergyman read the service in a black gown, and the pulpit resounded with election and the perseverance of the saints. 'Truly' said Thorndike, 'the tares of Puritanism were sown together with the grain of the Reformation in England.' The Reformation itself was very largely a Puritan

movement. From the estate of degradation to which the Church of England had partly come, it was delivered by the divine power of her Episcopacy which was providentially preserved during the tempest of the Reformation. By the grace of God, even the Calvinistic bishops and divines became upholders of the external worship and the constitution of the Church. The prejudices of Queen Elizabeth in favouring the old religion were 'in the hands of God, the instrument for stopping the progress of the Reformation.' The Church began to awake to a higher consciousness of her independent existence and her divine claims. The harbingers of a better day were Bancroft and Andrews. Then followed Bilson, Morton, Hall, Davenant, Buckner, Carleton, Field, Hooker and Jackson, men brought up under the Calvinistic influence, but who though still holding more or less peculiarly Calvinistic doctrines, had come to higher views of the Sacraments and ecclesiastical authority.

This movement was taken up by Laud, and during his episcopate the power of the Keys was maintained, and the rights, privileges and divine authority of the Church and her hierarchy asserted. The last, Cranmer and his fellow-workers had merged into a mere creation of the State. Now the Convocation continued to debate after the dissolution of Parliament, and Charles, as a reverential son of the Church suffered all to go forward under his sanction and authority. Then came back the painted windows which the Reformation had effaced. The choristers again filled the choir. Rich copes were used in the celebration of the Eucharist. Every knee bowed at the name of Jesus, and the altar was approached with that reverence which is due. The Church had now left Geneva and had its face towards Rome. Laud found Oxford 'a seminary of Calvinism and left it a school of orthodoxy.'

Richard Baxter, distinguished between the old Episcopal party with whom he agreed, and the new party which had turned its back on the Reformation. Bramhall refused to recognise the distinction, but it existed. The present orthodoxy of the Church is 'a development since the Reformation and a reaction upon it.' It is now impossible, the writer adds, to shake off the influence of the school of Laud.

CHAPTER XI

THE TRACT WRITERS AND THEIR ALLIES

FOUR years after the suspension of the Tracts, Newman was received into the Church of Rome. That he was tending logically to this, was seen by everyone but himself, and some of his party. In one of his earliest books he took up a position which if consistently maintained, was bound to bring him into conflict with the Reformation. He supposed a traditionary system in the first ages of the Church.¹ Of this system the Church was supposed to be the infallible keeper. It was at first undefined. It was not directly or explicitly in Scripture, but reposed vaguely in the bosom of the Church. It could not even be proved from the books of the first generation after the Apostles.² Catholicism, or the Catholic Church, kept its chief doctrines in reserve. They were esoteric, those who did not take them on the authority of the Catholic Church were heretics, who gathered up a system for themselves out of the scattered notices of truth in Scripture. The creeds were compiled from Apostolic tradition, or from primitive writings. There never was any need to collect the sense of Scripture.³ The heretics were classed together in one family on the theory that the most opposite heresies generate each other. Paul of Samosata had to bear the charges which the Catholic and orthodox world has always brought against him. He was arrogant, ostentatious, fond of popularity, and as the clergy chose him for their

¹ History of the Arians, vol. i, p. 26.

² Essays, vol. i, p. 186.

³ Arians, 153.

bishop, that was sufficient proof that they were very wicked clergy. Arians were in the school of Antioch; this is proof that it must have been a school of very wicked men. Like the Galatians, they had the fickle spirit of speculation, and did not submit to the Church. This short and easy method with heretics Newman applied to all who stood apart from the Anglican Church, which was supposed to be the lineal descendant of that early church, which had in its bosom the undefined tradition.

After the bishops had almost unanimously in their charges condemned the interpretation of the Articles in Tract 90, Newman's mind was for some time unsettled. His position had been that all Church authority was vested in the bishops, that they were the successors of the Apostles, and now that they were against him, either he was wrong or they did not represent the true Church. He began to suspect that Protestants and Anglicans were in the same condition as the old Eutychians and Monophysites in relation to the Church. At this time Wiseman's Article in the *Dublin Review* was put into his hands. We have already recorded the argument founded on the rhetoric of St Augustine. The Donatists were a sect of Episcopal heretics in the north of Africa, while the Catholic Church was over the whole world. It was not then, as now, divided into East and West, but was one Catholic Church co-extensive with the Roman Empire, and so the argument had apparently some force. The Donatists, like nearly all sects, boasted that they were the true Church, which had kept the faith whole and undefiled. They proved it from the Song of Solomon, in which it is written, 'Tell me where thou makest thy flock to rest at noon.' The Latin for 'at noon' is '*in meridie*,' 'in or under the meridian,' which answered to Africa. St Augustine refuted them from the Song of Solomon, where it is written of the Catholic Church, 'My dove, my undefiled is one.' Newman did not think much of Wiseman's article when he read it, but a friend drew his special attention to the words '*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*,' and repeated them till they kept ringing in his ears, and he began to see the force of the argument that the Catholic Church throughout the world was against the Anglicans, who

must come under the same category as Donatists and Methodists and the followers of Knox and Calvin.

In his retirement after the suspension of the Tracts for the Times, Newman wrote an Essay on Development, in which he was to trace the unfolding of the original traditional system of the Church, into the present system of defined dogmas. But which was the developed Church, that of England or Rome?

That antiquity was on the side of the Church of England, against the Church of Rome, had been always maintained by our old divines. With Newman this position took the form that the Church of England *rests* on Antiquity, but there had been 'developments.' In the sixteenth century these were put aside as excrescences or growths, not natural to the body. In the Church of Rome they were the traditional outcome of the traditional system of the infallible Church. In the progress of the composition of this essay, Newman perceived that the goal to which he was tending was not the Anglican.

He turned on the Church of England, and found that when tried by its fruits it was worse than the Methodists. The latter might be proved eccentric and fanatic, but they had higher and nobler vestiges or semblances of grace, than were ever found in the Church of England.¹ Wesley could not be mentioned without our being reminded of his 'self-reliance and self-conceit,' but when he was to be set off against the Anglican Church, he was a saint to be compared with St Vincent Ferrer and St Francis Xavier. The Anglicans may have grace just as all the world, even Pagans may have grace. They may live and die saints, but the highest gifts and graces are compatible with ultimate reprobation.² They may have grace in their sacraments, but it is only of the same kind as

¹ See Anglican Difficulties.

² It is to be hoped that this was only a private opinion, or popular not authoritative teaching. Something to the same effect is in the Rheims Notes to the New Testament. Justifying faith is there defined as the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. 'The Jew, the Heathen philosopher, and the Heretic, though they excelled in all works of moral virtues could not yet be just; and a Catholic Christian man, living but an ordinary honest life, either not greatly sinning, or supplying his faults by penance, is just.' Note on Romans i, 17.

may be had in a Methodist love feast,¹ and unless the grace they have brings them into the Catholic Church, it will avail but little. The Orders of the Anglican are not worth the money paid to the bishop's lawyer. They have nothing on which to rest. Here the Tractarians placed all their trust for their divine commission, but it was found to be without a base, and to vanish away as a vision of the night. 'The idea then of the divines of the Tractarian movement was simply and absolutely submission to an external authority. To such an authority they appealed, to it they betook themselves. There they found a haven of rest, there they looked out on the troubled surge of human opinion and upon the crazy vessels which were labouring without chart or compass upon it. Judge then the dismay, when, according to the Arabian tale, on their striking their anchors into the supposed soil, lighting their fires on it, and fixing in it the poles of their tents, immediately the island began to move, to heave, to splash, to frisk to and fro, to dive, and at last to swim away, spouting out inhospitable jets of water upon the credulous mariners who had made it their home.'²

Newman had been educated among the Evangelicals, and underwent a sensible conversion in reading Thomas Scott's 'Force of Truth.' This to the end of his life he believed to have been a real change. When a Roman Catholic he pitied the Anglicans, but he ascribed it to boundless grace that he had had the benefit of Anglican baptism, and was not born a Presbyterian or a Nonconformist.

F. W. Newman, in 1891, published contributions towards the early history of Cardinal Newman. The spirit and tone of the publication were not particularly fraternal, but it reveals a tendency to eccentricity in religion in all the Newman family. F. W. Newman does not believe that John Henry gave the true reason, in his *Apologia*, for leaving the Church of England, in fact he never expected candour from his brother. He did not even give him the credit of being the originator of Puseyism, that he ascribes to 'old Alexander Knox, a pious admirer of John Wesley.' Under one aspect

¹ Anglican Difficulties. ² *Ib.*

this may be true, but Knox and Wesley had rational elements that are wanting in Puseyism.

Dr Newman's friend, Pusey, was left behind undeveloped. He never got beyond that 'vanity of vanities' the Anglican Church. He supposed it to be identical with the primitive, and following 'the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' But Pusey's approaches to the primitive Church were always commensurate with his approaches to the Roman. He never ceased to believe that substantially the doctrines of the Church of England and those of the Church of Rome were one, and that they were identical with what was taught by the early Fathers. He had begun his public career as an expounder, and to some extent, a defender of what was called the rational theology of Germany.¹ He was afterwards convinced that the German Protestants were heretics, and that their aberrations were due to the want of the apostolic government of Episcopacy. They had no bishops.

Dr Pusey's theological or ecclesiastical activity may be divided into three sections. The first was his advocacy of the Tractarian view of the Church and the Sacraments. The second was marked by his efforts to harmonise the dogmas of the Church of Rome with the doctrines of the Church of England, and the third by his defence of the orthodox view of the authenticity and genuineness of the books of the Bible as opposed to the conclusions of the Bible critics.

To follow Pusey is, in a great measure, to follow Newman over ground already traversed. In a sermon on 'The Rule of Faith,' he gets over Article VI by saying that though Holy Scriptures are the source of all saving truth, it does not follow that everyone unguided is to draw for himself the truth out of that living well, nor, on the other hand, is he at liberty to reject what he cannot prove from Scripture. Besides Holy Scripture the Church has a guide external to itself, being illumined by God's Holy Spirit. It has a 'deposit' of faith committed. Timothy was not instructed to *tell* to others, but to *commit* that which was committed to him. What was thus given to the Fathers we are bound to believe. Antiquity was ever the test of truth and novelty of heresy, and for the plain reason that the Church is older than the oldest heresies.

¹ 'Historical Inquiry, etc.,' in answer to Hugh James Rose.

The actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist was the subject of many of Dr Pusey's discourses. He did not care to use the word transubstantiation, and consubstantiation he reckoned a term of reproach.¹ There were, however, two substances present, the body and blood, and the elements of bread and wine. We are said to receive the body and the blood, from which it is argued that they are present under the forms of the material elements. It is the doctrine of the Church of England that the wicked who receive the sacrament, receive the body and the blood of Christ, and that Jesus Christ thus actually present is the object of worship and adoration.² The attempt to explain this presence is not perhaps more successful than similar attempts made by others long before. It is said that where the consecrated bread is, there is the body of Christ, but, it is added, *sacramentally*, a word which may stand for anything, or if need be, for nothing,

It is maintained that our Articles are Lutheran in contradistinction to Zwinglian. According to Luther the sacramental efficacy was due to Christ's institution. According to Zwingle it was the same in kind as the word or other ordinances which had effect by kindling faith. The Lord's Supper has an inward grace as well as baptism, but because of the presence of Christ's body and blood, it is more than the sacrament of baptism. John VI, 51, is understood of this sacrament. Even Art. XXVIII which was written against Transubstantiation is made to do service for the actual presence of the substance of the body of Christ. This is said to be 'given' as well as 'taken,' which means more than 'received,' and the following words 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner' are supposed to aim at those who believe that there was a carnal presence.³ 'Spiritually' is explained as not opposed to 'really,' but only to 'carnally.' The Council of Trent admitted the real spiritual or sacramental food, not for the body but for the soul. The wicked may be partakers of the body and blood of Christ, but they 'are in no wise partakers of Christ.' In Pusey's words, 'the wicked receive to

¹ Sermon on the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

² 'An Essay on The Real Presence.'

³ See *supra*, p. 46, under Alexander Knox.

their condemnation the body and blood of Christ against which they sin.¹ The distinction between eating the body of Christ and yet not partaking of it, secures the real presence in a sense different from those who only admit a presence by faith or to the worthy receivers. The rest of the Article is explained with the ingenuity learned from Newman. The sacrament according to this Article 'is not to be gazed upon.' Here Pusey intervenes with the interpretation—it does not say 'it *may* not.' Again the Article says, 'it is not reserved by Christ's ordinance.' Here Pusey again comes in with 'does not condemn' explaining that the writers of the Articles had in view only the justification of their own practice and not the condemnation of others. The Church of England was to be united with the Church of Rome by means of Newman's interpretation of the Articles, and the modified representation of Romish doctrines found in Bossuet and Du Pin.² Pusey defended the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures from the most orthodox standpoint. The Bible critics were unbelievers and their criticism was the result of their unbelief.³

John Keble⁴ whose sermon marks externally the beginning of the Tractarian movement, was a poet rather than a theologian. We must often seek his theology in his poetry, where its aspect is brighter than when clothed in the form of dogma; yet he was essentially a dogmatist in the same sense as Newman, relying on outward authority more than on inward realisation. He had not, like Newman, come from the Evangelical School, nor did he 'speak of any time of conversion. There had been no spiritual or intellectual struggle. Brought up among those who leant on authority, and recognising no Church as of divine institution, or indeed as a Church, if it had not bishops, priests and deacons, he continued in the same faith to the end of life. He was the author of Tract 89, on 'The Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers,' which was left unfinished, and he defended Tract 90.⁵ Like all the party to which he belonged he pre-

¹ Pusey tells an awful story of a woman who partook unworthily, and immediately after became 'possessed.' Life, vol. ii, 519.

² See Eirenicon.

³ Pref. to Daniel, 1864.

⁴ B. 1792, d. 1866.

⁵ Letter to Jelf.

ferred the interpretations of the Scriptures found in the Fathers to those which depended on the learning of modern scholars, and he was so impervious to any lessons from the discoveries of science, that he solemnly believed the world was made in six days, and that the shells and fossil bones in the bowels of the earth were placed there as they are by the Creator's hands.¹ He had a happy spirit of conservative repose. He loved the whole world and hated nothing but liberal politics and progressive theology.

Any approaches which Keble made to the Church of Rome were only in such things as he thought compatible with perfect allegiance to the Church of England. He instituted confession in his parish, believing it prevented immorality. He gave to the Virgin Mary 'all but adoring love.' Newman rejoiced at this approach to Virgin worship, but to the last found Keble far off from the Romish faith. He complained that Keble did not ascribe to baptism the holiness or innocency of childhood when he spoke of a little child's 'soft sleeping face.' Yet it was presumed Keble really did believe that the innocency of childhood was not due to nature but to baptism. What he may omit to express as a poet, he believes as a dogmatist. That Keble ascribed to the humanity of Jesus the attributes of divinity is only to be expected from his theological position. He could sing of

'The awful Child on Mary's knee.'

It should however be added that he also sung

'Was not our Lord a little child,
Taught by degrees to pray,
By father dear, and mother mild
Instructed day by day?'

a more orthodox view of that humanity which grew in wisdom as in stature.²

Henry Edward Manning, who died Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, was not one of the Tract writers, but he was

¹ This was said to Buckland whom he once met on a stage coach.

² The *Dublin Review* said of Keble's Sermon on 'Primitive Tradition,' that but for a few sentences in which he tacks his theory to the XXXIX Articles the sermon might have been preached in St Peter's at Rome, 1827, p. 49.

one of the best representatives of Tractarian principles. As in the case of Newman, tendencies can be traced in his earliest sermons which some would say were bound logically to lead him to the Church of Rome. In one on 'The Rule of Faith'¹ he maintained that the Church of England in making the Scriptures the rule of faith, did not teach that they were so clear as not to need an interpreter. Every man was not at liberty to interpret them for himself. It had been argued by Roman Catholics that if the Church is limited by the Scriptures, there is no one to determine if the Church teaches according to the Scriptures. This question other Reformed Churches might answer for themselves, but the Church of England takes her interpretation from Catholic tradition. The rule of faith is retrospective, and the first axiom of Apostolic truth is that whatsoever is new is not of Christ.

In a sermon on the 'Unity of the Church,' Manning said that all must believe in the one Church. This is necessary to salvation, for out of the Church none can be saved. This was said to warn those of the Church of England who helped sectarian communities or were present at any Non-conformist worship. The unity of the Church was proved from the Fathers. St Cyril said, 'Avoid the hateful assemblies of heretics and cleave always to the Holy Catholic Church in which thou wert regenerated.' It is shown from St Augustine that heretics do not love God, and schismatics do not love their neighbour, and that there can be no love of God outside the Catholic Church.

This idea of the Church implied the conveyance of grace by the Church's ordinances. Regeneration is by baptism literally. By it we are made new creatures. 'Old things are passed away, and all things have become new.' We look upward to a new heaven and stand upon a new earth.² It may be that this is qualified by what is said farther on, 'Those whose lives show that they are not new creatures, in whom old things have not passed away, are still members of His body and have received "that thing which by nature they cannot have."' The baptised have a sense which anticipates truth.

¹ Preached at the primary visitation of the Bishop of Chichester, 1838.

² Sermons, vol. i, p 20.

They know it before they hear it.'¹ Yet it is added that the multitude of the baptised do not know Christ, do not belong to the Church invisible, are not converted. Baptism then is not conversion, for every baptised soul needs a perfect conversion to God.² The baptised are made sons, but they are not led by the Spirit, only some retain the spiritual reality. All are not Israel who are of Israel. Notwithstanding the light infused by baptism, new faculties awakened, new powers implanted, there are no outward signs of actual grace.

It is 'too true that thousands in the visible Church show less love and less compunction than many who are in separation from the unity of the body of Christ,' an admission by the way that scarcely agrees with what had just been quoted from St Augustine. A church with authority and the power of dispensing the divine gifts must have a jurisdiction of its own. It cannot be subject to the State. It is a divine kingdom, and in matters spiritual must govern itself. But this government the Church of England has not, and never had since the Reformation. Before that it was independent of the civil power, but the royal supremacy was established in the time of Henry VIII. The Church of Rome was found to answer this ideal while the Church of England failed. When Manning left the Church of England, Julius Hare, who was Archdeacon in the same diocese said of him, 'Our lost brother is a man whom it is scarcely possible to know without loving him, but you will also feel that the loss is one which the whole diocese must needs deplore. It has been the loss of one who has been author of diverse good works among us, he has been the fosterer of every good work. Nay, the whole Church cannot but mourn over the loss of one of the holiest of her sons. One who had a special gift of winning hearts to God. He has become a victim to the pestilence which has been stalking through our Church.'³

William Palmer of Worcester College wrote a treatise on the Church of Christ⁴, in which he spoke of the perpetuity and unity of the Church as a visible community. It was one, though among the different branches communion might be interrupted. It is constituted by a succession of bishops from

¹ Vol. ii, p. 23.

² Vol. iii, p. 9.

³ Charge of 1857.

⁴ Third edition, 1882.

the time of the Apostles. On this theory of the visible Episcopal unity of the Church, it was difficult to defend the Reformation, which resulted in division. But Palmer justified the Reformation and the Reformers in other countries as well as in England. Luther did not intend to separate from the Church Catholic, nor did he really separate. The same with Zwingle. He and his followers did not separate, but they were separated and treated as heretics. The Reformed Churches on the Continent were left without the apostolic ministry. But this is justified on the plea of necessity. Their position was extraordinary, and the result of circumstances which they did not create. The same argument serves for the Church of Scotland. The Reformers of that country were not schismatics. They did not separate themselves from the Catholic Church, but were expelled by the Romish party. They were without Episcopacy, which was their misfortune, but they were not opposed to it. The *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism was first taught by Andrew Melville.

The Church of England retained the apostolical constitution. The whole body ecclesiastical reformed itself. It is often urged by the enemies of the English Reformation that it was the work of the civil ruler or of the state. But the power of the Pope was not transferred to the King. It was simply suppressed. The bishops received their office through a royal commission, but this only concerned their temporal, not their spiritual duties. The injunctions issued by the sovereign were only confirmatory of those already made by the Church. The kings of England before the Reformation had often issued such injunctions without asking the consent of convocation. All the changes effected in the time of Edward were done by authority of the bishops. The deprivation of some bishops in this reign by the authority of the king could not be justified, yet they were deprived not for heresy but for disobedience.

In the time of Edward there were no variations of doctrine. The Church remained the same as under Henry. The XLII Articles had been compiled, but they were never authorised by any convocation. They were never actually in force. The XXXIX Articles were not sanctioned by convocation till 1562, four years after Elizabeth had begun her reign.

The consecration of Parker is valid, because, though the bishops who consecrated him had no jurisdiction *de facto*, two of them had it *de jure*. It was a better consecration than has often been performed by the Romish Church in England, when a single bishop was consecrated on the mere authority of the Pope. The Church of England receives priests ordained by bishops thus consecrated, but it is as a matter of favour and for the sake of unity.

Walter Farquhar Hook, Dean of Chichester, long known as Vicar of Leeds, dissented in many things from the Tractarians. He was the son of James Hook, Dean of Worcester, the advocate of pluralities, and some other things now swept away by what we reckon salutary ecclesiastical reforms. The Dean of Chichester had some reputation as a writer, chiefly in the line of history and biography. He took the Tractarian view of the Church, but he was at the same time a decided Protestant. He boasted of his safety in the *via media*, but he was so hard pressed on each side that he found it a very narrow way. He wrote few pages which did not bristle with 'ultra Protestant' 'Romanism' 'heresy' and 'schism.' In a youthful sermon preached when he was in Deacon's orders, at an Episcopal visitation, he set forth the same views of the Church of England, its relation to the Church Catholic and to the sects, which he maintained to the end of his life. As an historical fact, the English Reformation was effected by the whole body of eminent ecclesiastics then existing in the Anglican community. To make this good, neither the efforts of Cranmer in the time of Edward, nor the settlement under Elizabeth were regarded as the Reformation. That had been going on for a century before Elizabeth, and was not completed till the Restoration of King Charles.

This view of the Reformation is followed out in the 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.' The 'reformed' Archbishops simply carried on the work of their predecessors, who never had made any break with the Catholic Church. Cranmer to the end of his life professed to be a Catholic.¹ Matthew Parker prevented the disciples and friends of the foreign Reformers from overturning the Church and founding

¹ Vol. ii, 147.

'a Protestant sect.' As, however, Cranmer and Parker were friends of Calvin, and as they were both Erastians as to the relations of Church and State, some purification was necessary to make them look good Catholic men. The Dean did his best to give a like complexion to Grindal and Whitgift and believed he had succeeded, but Abbot he was bound to abandon as a hopeless Archiepiscopal reprobate. It was reserved for Laud to declare 'the necessity of the order of Diocesan bishops' with a 'separation from foreign sects, and a repudiation of the doctrines of their apostle Calvin.'

In a famous sermon before the Queen, on the text, 'Hear the Church,' the Elizabethan bishops were credited with upholding the principles of the English Reformation, on the one side against 'Papists' and on the other against 'ultra-Protestants,' who wished 'to introduce the foreign system,' and revolutionise the Church. The adherence of the Elizabethan bishops to the policy of Elizabeth is taken for proof that they were Anglo-Catholics of the modern style of Anglo-Catholicism, but the Dean seems afterwards to have improved in his knowledge of history, when he wrote 'it required nothing less than the strong will of Elizabeth, to compel the bishops who bore rule in our Church in the first years of her reign to act as bishops ought to act.'¹ She lived to see a school of divines who approved of her policy, but it was not till the Restoration that the Anglicans or Catholics were recognised by Parliament and Convocation.

As a Protestant, Dean Hook advocated justification by faith, as taught by Luther. Redemption he spoke of as a 'plan,' devised by the 'Sacred Three.' Hell was eternal, in the sense of never ending. He preached the necessity of conversion after the fashion of the Evangelicals, but he shared Bishop Marsh's opinion about modern hymns, which he thought of 'questionable character.' He was even doubtful about metrical psalms, the reason apparently being that they were an innovation from foreign Protestants.² He acknowledged the supremacy of the Bible as a rule of faith. General Councils had erred. The Church is not infallible, but its teaching helps us to discern the truth of the Scriptures. The

¹ Vol. ii, p. 31.

² The Church, etc. 1876, p. 88.

doctrines of the Primitive Church are found in our Prayer Book, Articles and Formulas.¹

The Holy Spirit gives us a spiritual understanding in spiritual things. As the Church is the depositary of grace, so the Bible is the depositary of truth.² Our Reformers separated the two Sacraments from all pretended Sacraments, which shows the importance they attached to the two. 'They are channels for the divine gifts.' Through the elements of bread and wine grace may pass to the souls of the faithful.³ Luther is praised for having been so strong on the side of sacramental grace, but he is blamed for not having seen that this grace could only be conveyed by those who were in the Apostolical succession.

William Wilberforce was regarded by Evangelical interpreters of prophecy, as one who was in the mind of the ancient prophets when they spoke of the latter days, but Archdeacon Daubeney doubted if he was even a genuine member of the Church of England. His sons came under the influence of the Tractarian movement, and atoned for their father's deficiencies. Two of them betook themselves to the Church of Rome, and the third became Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester. Samuel Wilberforce is better known as an eloquent preacher, and an active working bishop, than as a theologian. At the University he was a member of an Evangelical club, which had the name of the Bethel reunion. The members were religious young men who avoided Sunday parties. In the Hampden controversy, Wilberforce was among the protesters: but he had only read Newman's 'Extracts' from the lectures, and afterwards wrote to Hampden that he could see no heresy in them, and that Newman's imputations were 'most false.' He passed from the Evangelicals, but he never entirely agreed with the Tractarians, though the favour he showed them in one of his Charges earned him the title of their apologist. He was one of the contributors to the *British Critic* when Newman was editor, but when he expressed his dissent from Pusey, Newman dispensed with his help. Of the Tracts he wrote, 'With them, you know, I have never agreed. The views on

¹ Discourses on Controversies of the day, 1853, p. 11.

² Ibid p. 18.

³ Ibid vol. ii, p. 20.

many points especially in the Tract on Reserve, have appeared to me so dangerous that at all risks, I felt I must bear my feeble testimony against them in my Oxford services.'¹ He pointed out as Newman's essential error, that he directed penitents to the Church and not to Christ. Newman had said 'there is no second laver, but do not despair, you are still in the Church, go on using her ordinances.' Wilberforce adds, 'not a word of the Healer.'² Of Pusey's letter in defence of Newman, he wrote 'that it was deeply, painfully, utterly sophistical and false.' He says for instance 'that he does not think himself, as an English Churchman, at liberty to hold Roman doctrine, but he does not censure any Roman doctrine, 'whilst he holds his Canonry at Christ Church, and his position amongst *us* on condition of signing articles, one half of which are taken up in declaring different figments of Rome to be dangerous deceits and blasphemous fables.' Pusey's language about the Church of England is called 'patronising' 'fault finding,' and 'apologetic.' The two brothers were reckoned among Newman's victims to the Church of Rome, while Samuel was regarded as a brand plucked from the burning with the smell of the burning still upon him.³

Robert Wilberforce was best known by his treatise on the Incarnation.⁴ The argument is that while what is called Rationalism finds in man himself the commencement of all renewal, the Church attributes it to the entrance into humanity of a supernatural Being. The new or restored man comes not through the natural perfection of individuals, but through Christ who became man that He might ennoble the race of man. His influence is diffused through the Church. By the sacramental system all men are bound to the second Adam. The incarnation is extended to them in the sacraments. Through these God incarnates Himself.

Christ's earthly body is the medium through which life and health are conveyed to other bodies. It was so in the days of His flesh, the multitudes sought to touch Him. The humanity of Christ was real. He was perfectly man. He

¹ Life, vol. i, 205.

² Ibid 232.

³ See Mozley's Reminiscences, vol. i, 99.

⁴ The Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ and its relation to Mankind and to the Church. 2nd Ed. 1849.

participated in human ignorance, in the weakness of man's understanding. He wept, He sympathised—yet he was God as well as man. How divine Omniscience is compatible with human ignorance is not for us to understand. Because Jesus was divine as well as human His death was an atonement, effecting a real change in the condition of man. His body natural has a real connection with the body mystical—that is, the Church, so that union with the mystical body is union with His natural body ; and this union is through the outward ordinance which has been much neglected, because of the tendency to prefer natural to revealed religion. This is shown by putting inward acts such as faith and love in the place of the Sacraments through which Christ vouchsafes to join men to His manhood. The humanity of the Incarnate Word was slain. That offering to God is repeated by Christ's ministers in the Sacrament of the Communion. What the Great High Priest does in Heaven, the earthly priest does on earth. The Eucharistic offering is a constituent part of His work. 'Through the intervention of his heavenly Head the earthly sacrificer exhibits to the Father the body of Christ which is the one only sacrifice for sin' (p. 371).

George Anthony Denison, Archdeacon of Frome, identified himself with the Tractarian party and never departed from its greatest extremes during the many revolutions of thought which have since taken place. He has condemned everything which is called progress in the history of England. The reception of William of Orange was a fatal departure from national rectitude. This direful event was the fount and source of England's present woes. A Presbyterian not belonging to any branch of the Church Catholic became the head of the Church, while a Catholic king was driven into exile. One of the first results was the overthrow of the Church of Scotland. Then Convocation was suppressed because the Lower House suspended a Socinian bishop.¹ In our day we have the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the passing of an Act for Roman Catholic emancipation, giving freedom respectively to Nonconformists and to Roman Catholics. We have bishoprics suppressed in Ireland, and in

¹ Hoadly, called by his enemies a Socinian.

England the establishment of Board Schools in imitation of Julian the apostate, who established one in every city.¹

The dreary waste of the eighteenth century was due to the poison introduced in 1688 into the constitution of Church and State. The Protestant watchword of 'civil and religious liberty' is blasphemy against the Word of God. Religion is a matter of revelation, and should be accepted because it is revealed. The Church is the pillar and ground of truth, the authorised teacher and interpreter of the right faith. There may be liberty in civil matters, but in religion there must be obedience.

The faith of the Catholic Church is objective, and to objective religion Protestantism has an instinctive repugnance. The Tractarian movement was the time of refreshing—the revival of Christian life and Catholic doctrine. The Evangelicals had done something. They had the right foundation, but they built with materials of their own devising. The Tractarian movement, on the other hand, has recalled the Church to the facts of apostolical succession and the efficacy of sacraments. These are the essence of the Church of England, the conditions of her life, and those who do not believe these doctrines have no right to hold office in her communion nor to receive her emoluments.² In accordance with this belief, the Archdeacon, in imitation of Bishop Marsh and Bishop Phillpotts, tried to exclude the Evangelical party from the Church of England. He believed that in virtue of the consecration the bread and wine in the communion were changed into the actual body and blood of Christ, and received not in any spiritual or subjective sense but literally and by all who did partake, whether good or bad, though in the one case to profit, in the other to condemnation.

As examining chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Denison imposed this doctrine on the candidates and refused to present them to the Bishop for ordination if they did not believe as he did. This was the old illegal innovation of requiring an additional test besides that of the authorised formularies. The defence was by the subtle distinction

¹ Notes of my Life, p. 14.

² Sermon on National Unthankfulness, 1854.

between a test of admission and a test of doctrine. The Bishop interposed and the Archdeacon was defeated.¹

The persistency with which the Archdeacon preached his favourite notion about the actual presence evoked a prosecution. His words are 'that in the Eucharist there is not the presence of an influence emanating from a Thing absent, but the supernatural and invisible presence of a Thing present; of His very body and very blood present under the form of bread and wine.'² Again 'that worship is done to the body and blood under the form of bread and wine by reason of the Godhead, with which they are permanently united.' This doctrine was condemned as contrary to the Articles of Religion.³ The Archdeacon has been unable to stem the tide of progress. He has led the forlorn hope against freedom of thought and the heresies which he reckons its inevitable results. He has seen heresies spring up in the very party which he regarded as the restorers of the Catholic faith. But he has long been on the losing side, and like a character in the famous allegory, he can now only sit in his cave's mouth grinning at the pilgrims as they go by.⁴

In closing this eventful period of nineteenth century history, we strive to avoid the temptation of making comments. Men see it according to the different angles from which it is viewed. Roman Catholics boast that through its influence their Church has been resuscitated in England after three centuries of bare existence.⁵ The Church of England, on the other hand, since that movement, has awoken like a giant refreshed with wine.

That a revival of some kind was bound to come, might have been predicted beforehand. The Church was ready to

¹ The Bishop was Dr Spencer of Madras who was acting for the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Denison vindicated himself from the charge of wishing to refuse ordination unless the candidates agreed with him. His argument was that not being the bishop, he could not refuse ordination.

² From the Archdeacon's summary of what he taught in his sermons.

³ The Archdeacon escaped deprivation by a technical point in law.

⁴ The above was in the hands of the compositor when the Venerable Archdeacon departed this life in the 91st year of his age.

⁵ See W. S. Lilly, *Fortnightly Review*, 1879.

awake whenever earnest men felt inspired to speak. If the Oxford movement has stamped on the Church the impress of the High Church party, it has been still more remarkable for the changes effected on that party itself. A keen observer has shown how from this movement the High Church party has received truth against which, had it come in any other shape, they would have closed their eyes and 'ears.'¹ The next sentence is 'a better spirit has been breathed into hundreds, who but for this new movement would have remained as their fathers were before them, mere Nimrods, ram-rods, and fishing rods.' The same critic, speaking of the natural finality of the Tractarians said, 'They openly abjured the name of Protestant, they allowed that if cut off from the Roman Communion the Church of England would be schismatic, but they maintained that the two Churches were not really separated, and that their mutual excommunications were matters which time would clear up. This view, however, was too contrary to common sense to be long defended even by its inventors. They soon acknowledged their error, and their leader, renouncing for ever the Anglican allegiance, passed over the Rubicon and rushed into the heart of the Italian territory, but not all who advanced to that fatal frontier had courage to cross with Cæsar. The rabble of his army remained shivering on the brink.' Different influences not to be overlooked were in the way of reaction. Men bounded to other extremes. They could not believe that the great interests of the world, of humanity, of Christianity, were bound up with such questions as Episcopal succession, patristic tradition and sacramental grace.

¹ Conybeare in *Edinburgh Review*, 1853.

CHAPTER XII

THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY

THE doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration does not seem to have been discussed at the Reformation. Our Reformers retained the language of the old Fathers, which they found in use in the Church of Rome. Cranmer expressly declared that he wished to retain all the speeches, phrases, and forms of speech, which the Fathers had used concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, yet while retaining patristic language, he did not take it literally, but as figurative and rhetorical, at the same time declaring that he agreed with Œcolampadius and Zwingli. He set aside what he considered to be the Romish doctrine attached to these phrases, and understood them in the same sense as the Swiss Reformers. In clinging to patristic language while rejecting the Roman interpretation, he followed Calvin and Beza. They all set aside what is called the doctrine of the confer of grace, that is the *ex opere operato*. Very little was said about Baptismal Regeneration in the seventeenth century, and that little is often in the way of reconciling it with the Calvinistic doctrine of election. Hooker defends it in this connection in a passage which has often been quoted, 'There are that elevate too much the ordinary and immediate means of life relying wholly upon the bare conceit of this eternal election, which notwithstanding includeth a subordination of means without which we are not actually brought to enjoy what God secretly did intend.'¹ After showing that the means are necessary, and

¹ Ecc. Pol. b. v, s. 60.

although men may be pre-ordained to life, they are not called elect saints till after baptism. 'Predestination bringeth not to life without the grace of external vocation, wherein our baptism is implied.'¹ Hooker is very strong in defence of baptismal regeneration, even saying that baptism 'both declareth and maketh us Christians,' but though writing against a mistake into which Calvinists might fall, he yet writes from the Calvinistic standpoint. In the discourse on Justification he argues that there is no final falling from grace, that the sheep are 'effectually called,' and the *Son of God abideth* in the elect. Calvin said that grace was not tied to the sacraments, and Hooker in like manner, says that 'all receive not the grace of God which receive the Sacraments of His grace.'² To this correspond the words of other Calvinistic Anglicans. Usher said 'The Sacrament is only effective to those and to all those who belong to the election of grace;' Carleton says 'All that receive baptism are called the children of God, regenerate, justified, for to us they must be taken for such in charity until they show themselves other.' To the same effect, Prideaux, 'Baptism only pledges an external and sacramental regeneration, while the Church in charity presumes that the Holy Ghost confers an inward regeneration.' Other Calvinistic writers separated baptism definitely from regeneration. Bullinger in the *Decades*,—once a semi-official book in the Church of England,—says that 'The first beginning of our fellowship with Christ is not by the sacraments,' and Thomas Cartwright in a passage which Hooker quotes to refute says, 'He which is not a Christian before he come to receive baptism, cannot be made a Christian by baptism, which is only the seal of the grace of God, before received.'³

In the eighteenth century, the question of regeneration in baptism took a new form. Its advocates were no longer doctrinal Calvinists. The Methodists preached that men must be born again. They were answered that those to

¹ Ibid. s. 57.

² Ibid. s. 57.

³ This *passage* was quoted by Legh Richmond as Hooker's. Bishop Wilberforce charges Legh Richmond with quoting *passages* from Cartwright as Hooker's, but only one is Cartwright's. 'Life of Wilberforce,' vol. i, p. 46.

whom they preached were already born again in baptism. Wesley, who always looked at the practical side in preference to the theoretical, said, that although the Church of England teaches that all the baptised are regenerate, he saw no evidence of regeneration in the great multitude of the baptised, and he must go on preaching the necessity of being born again. There must be an actual regeneration in heart and life, men must realise that they are sons of God. Those of the Methodists who were Calvinists, that is the Evangelical clergy, denied that regeneration always accompanied baptism.

The controversy was renewed in 1812 by Richard Mant the Bampton Lecturer for that year. The substance of what he said was afterwards published in the form of tracts by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The first tract was called 'Regeneration, the Grace of Baptism,' the writer maintaining that the grace invariably, in all cases, accompanies the outward ceremony. Unbelievers and sinners, though made by baptism the members of Christ and children of God, must, in a certain sense, be converted if they would ultimately succeed to the inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven. But this is only for unbelievers and sinners. It is not necessary for every baptised person to undergo a conversion in order to be saved. That has already taken place in baptism. If there be a falling away, the return is renovation or conversion in a secondary or improper sense. It is a reconversion.

Mant was answered by John Scott¹ and by T. T. Biddulph.² They both took the same line of argument, maintaining that Mant's doctrine was not that of the Bible, nor of the Church of England, and that in itself it had a very dangerous tendency. Scott examined the texts quoted for baptismal regeneration. Jesus had said, 'He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.' Scott added the next clause which Mant had not quoted, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' The omission, 'is baptised' is not without design. It avoided making baptism essential to salvation, while it laid the main stress on believing. Faith is the essential

¹ Vicar of North Ferriby and Lecturer of Holy Trinity Church, Hull.

² Minister of St James's, Bristol.

qualification. Another text was,¹ 'Buried with Him in baptism, ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God.' Here the stress is on faith. 'The washing of water'² is interpreted by Mant as baptism giving sanctification and purity. Scott added the context, 'by the word.' It was not the mere baptism that gave purity but 'the washing of water by the word.' The text³ in St Peter 'baptism doth also now save us' was not quoted by Mant, but other writers had used it omitting the words, 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience towards God.' 'He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost'⁴ is the only passage in the Bible in which regeneration seems applicable to baptism. The 'washing' and 'renewing' are separated by Waterland and others, but their connection is the same as that of water and Spirit. The one is the sign, the other the thing signified. The renovation is the first quickening. The Galatians were baptised, yet St Paul addressed them as little children of whom he travailed in birth again till Christ be formed in them. The Jews were said to be regenerated by circumcision, yet St Paul says, 'He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart in the spirit;' in like manner he is not a Christian who is one outwardly, but he is a Christian who is one inwardly.

Mant admitted that to be born of God is the same as to be a son of God. On this, Biddulph quoted St Paul to the Galatians, 'Ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,' but faith may exist previous to baptism and independently of it, as was the case with the converts on the day of Pentecost. From this it follows that men may be the children of God really though not manifestly before they are baptised. Baptism is the symbol of salvation. The outward washing is the figure of the inward. There is no other necessary effect following the symbol but that which is also symbolical. It is an evidence of God's favour if we possess the necessary qualification. It is the seal appended, conditional

¹ Col. ii, 12.² Eph. v, 27.³ 1, Pet. iii, 21.⁴ Titus iii, 4-7.

as everything external in the dealings of God with man must be. Jesus was baptised—He needed no regenerating grace, but His baptism was a manifestation of his Messiahship, so our baptism is a declaration of our profession as Christians.

The question is then argued from the Church formularies. Biddulph quoted Article XIII, from which he infers that if grace is not received before baptism, works done then are not pleasant to God. Every candidate for baptism being unregenerate, his offering himself as a candidate cannot be pleasing to God, but must have the nature of sin. Faith and repentance are the necessary pre-requisites for baptism. Now true repentance¹ is a change of heart, and to have faith, according to St John, is to be born of God. In the baptismal service we pray that the 'child may be born again.' But the prayer may be granted or it may not. That depends on the condition of the person concerned. The Church speaks of the baptised as regenerate on the supposition that they are sincere in their profession. The regeneration is suspended on the stipulation. This hypothetical principle pervades all the services, and is the key to such expressions in the Epistles as 'faithful,' 'holy,' 'elect,' applied to whole churches.

The last head is that the doctrine of Mant has a dangerous tendency. It is a regeneration without effects. The mere act of baptism does not make people better than they were. Moreover it is the old doctrine of *opus operatum* of sacraments, against which our Reformation was a solemn protest.

Christopher Bethell, Bishop of Bangor, treated the subject historically and controversially in 1822, and more fully in 1845.² He distinguished between baptismal regeneration as taught in the Church of Rome, and as taught in the Church of England. In the one it was the Sacrament which regenerated by an inherent virtue, in the other it was God through the Sacrament. The regeneration too was different. In the one the very essence and being of original sin was removed, but with the latter the corruption of nature remains, even in the regenerate. Bethell found Dr Pusey's idea of regeneration to approach the Roman Catholic, if not to be identical with it, while he states his own in these words, 'Though that principle of life contains the germs of those graces, which are the

¹ μετενοία.

² Fourth edition.

ordinary fruits of the Holy Ghost, we do not conceive that any actual development of them or any certain conversion of the heart to God takes place at that time in the souls of infants.' ¹

Bethell adopts the distinction made by Waterland between regeneration and renovation. The former is in baptism, the latter is a change of mind or disposition. In adults this is the qualification or capacity for regeneration, in infants regeneration takes place without renovation. Baptism is not only an engagement to lead a new life, but a change wrought in the soul by a benefit infused through the joint operation of water and the Spirit. It is a seal, not as a legal seal to a document, but the baptised are sealed and stamped, as the Jews had the outward mark of circumcision. Though made children of God in baptism, they might cease to be numbered among God's children.

The Anglo-Calvinistic idea of regeneration in baptism as set forth by Hooker was revived by Edward Irving. Opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of regeneration led some persons naturally to the denial of the doctrine in any sense. God works through His ordinances, but His grace is not tied to them, is the position taken up by Calvin. The most pronounced form of this view is found with Edward Irving, who fell back on the old standards of the Church of Scotland, of which he was a minister, where he found these words, 'We utterly condemn the vanity of those who make the Sacraments to be nothing but naked and bare signs.' He confesses to having had his mind directed to the subject by Hooker, 'the venerable companion of his early studies.' Though many who were washed in infancy with the water of baptism grow up children of the evil one, yet we are not to overlook the meaning of the ordinance to those who continue steadfast in the right way. As the seeds of a corrupt nature are derived from parents, so those who are baptised into Christ have the seeds of a spiritual nature conveyed to them. To separate the effectual washing of the Spirit from baptism, is to make void the ordinances of the visible Church. On the other hand, we are not absolutely and necessarily to connect the washing with the administration of baptism. To do this would be to take the gift out of the electing love of the Father

¹ Pref. xxx.

and fix it on the outward act of the priest. Regeneration is conversion, baptism introduces 'believers and their children into the inheritance of the Holy Ghost.' It is only believers and the children of believers who are to be baptised, and the benefits of baptism, even with those who are baptised are received only by the elect, for on them as the Westminster Confession says 'Privileges and benefits are conferred by baptism.' These are, 'Ingrafting into Christ, regeneration and remission of sins.'¹ All who are children of God, or the elect, are regenerated at their baptism, but all who are baptised are not regenerated.

In 1850, the final effort was made to expel Calvinism from the Church of England. This was in the great Gorham case promoted by Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter. The signal failure of Bishop Marsh with his eighty-seven questions might have been a warning, but it was not.² George Cornelius Gorham was Vicar of St Just in the diocese of Bishop Phillpotts. Like many of the Evangelical clergy at this time he was a Calvinist in doctrine, and was therefore not in high esteem with his diocesan. In 1847 he was presented to the living of Brampford Speke. It was a custom with the Lord Chancellors when giving preferment, to require testimonials signed by three beneficed clergymen and countersigned by the bishop. These were obtained, but the Bishop after countersigning added a note casting doubts on Gorham's orthodoxy. The Lord Chancellor presented, but the Bishop refused to institute until he had examined the presentee as to his soundness in the faith, according to the Bishop's view of what is sound. The examination lasted for six days, and the questions were one hundred and forty-nine. The first question was 'Prove that baptism and the Lord's Supper are necessary to salvation.' The answer was 'Scripture nowhere says that they are.' The next question was if they were generally necessary, to which the answer was 'Yes, certainly.' The point at which the

¹ This Confession is very strong on the baptismal regeneration of the elect. It says that in baptism grace is not only offered, but exhibited and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost. Art. XXVIII.

² In the Church of Scotland in 1717 an attempt was made by the Presbytery of Auchterarder to impose a test in addition to the Confession, but it was found to be illegal.

Bishop was driving was baptismal regeneration, at this time the prominent note of distinction between the two Church parties. The one took regeneration in baptism literally and absolutely, the other took it figuratively or conditionally. Gorham did not connect grace with baptism, but maintained the necessity of a prevenient act of grace to make those who were to be baptised worthy recipients. Grace might be before or after baptism, and was conditional on the fulfilment of certain promises: the regeneration was hypothetical. This did not satisfy the Bishop, who took the words of the baptismal service in what seems to be their literal meaning. He supported his case from such words in Scripture as 'born of water,' 'baptism for the remission of sins,' and 'the laver of regeneration.' The Court of Arches decided in the Bishop's favour. On appeal to the Privy Council, the decision was for Gorham, not indeed in favour of Gorham's interpretation, but that the Bishop and he were free to take the baptismal service in their own sense. The question was left open. This decision has been called the charter of freedom in the Church of England.

Henry Phillpotts, the prosecutor of Gorham, was a typical High Churchman of the old school. He hailed the 'Tracts for the Times' as a revival of High Church doctrines, yet he lamented the extremes to which they went. He did not approve of prayer for the dead, nor of absolution by the clergy, and he expressed a special disapprobation of the doctrine of reserve in religious teaching. He believed that the literal and grammatical sense of the Articles was Catholic, but that they were incompatible with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. He was a strong Protestant as well as High Churchman, as much opposed to the Roman Catholic as to the Dissenter. In his public life he opposed every measure which liberal men would call progressive, such as granting civil rights to Roman Catholics, and educating Roman Catholic children in Ireland without requiring them to be taught the Bible. He also opposed secular education in England, or even religious education if limited to the general principles on which all Christians are agreed. He was great in such questions as that children baptised by Nonconformists, should not be buried in consecrated ground, and whether such

baptism conveyed grace. He dreaded the influence of the Evangelical clergy, saying that they required vigilance on the part of the bishops. He opposed the Registration Act as robbing children of baptism, and he was the only bishop who in 1836 opposed the commutation of tithes, recommending to 'abide by the stuff.'

Phillpotts, as we might expect, was dissatisfied with the decision in the Gorham case. It was a judgment of the Privy Council, who were not competent judges in matters ecclesiastical, and it was against the catholicity, and therefore the essential character of our Church as a sound branch of the Church of Christ by declaring that it does not hold as of faith one of the articles of the creed of Christendom.¹ He unchurched all foreign Protestants who had no bishops, and the Church of Scotland which we are commanded to pray for by the Canon of 1603, could only be prayed for as we pray for our 'enemies, persecutors and slanderers' and 'that it may please God to turn their hearts.'²

In his Charge of 1842, Phillpotts criticised the 'Tracts for the Times,' spoke of the great good they had done in calling attention to the claims of the Church as a divine institution, and to the efficacy of the Sacraments. But as a consistent Protestant he denounced Tract XC as attempting an impossibility. The XXXIX Articles could not be reconciled with the decrees of Trent. A few instances are given of what he called the 'absolute incompatibility.' The sixth Article makes Holy Scripture the only ground of faith, while the decrees of Trent say that the 'written word and the unwritten tradition are to have equal pious affection and veneration.' The Apocryphal books are excluded by the Article, while the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on all who deny that any of them is canonical. The ninth Article says that 'the infection of nature doth remain in them that are regenerate,' and that it 'hath of itself the nature of sin.' The Council of Trent, while admitting that St Paul says of concupiscence that it is sin, explains that 'it proceeds from sin,' and that 'everything which had the true and proper nature of sin is taken away in baptism.' The thirty-fifth Article admits

¹ Pastoral Letter 1851.

² Letter to Archdeacon of Totness, p. 26.

only two sacraments and says that 'the other five are not sacraments of the Gospel.' Trent, on the other hand, has an anathema for every one who says 'that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament.' The twenty-eighth Article pronounces Transubstantiation 'repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,' while the Council of Trent teaches that our Lord Jesus Christ is 'truly, really and substantially contained in the sacrament,' and not 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.' There are anathemas for those who say that the sacrament is 'not to be solemnly carried about that it may be adored.' The twenty-second Article calls 'Purgatory' a 'fond thing vainly invented.' The Council of Trent has an anathema for all who deny Purgatory as 'a place for punishment after the forgiveness of sin before the sinner can be admitted to heaven.'

CHAPTER XIII

HARE, MAURICE, KINGSLEY, F. W. ROBERTSON

THERE is a class of churchmen who might be described as on the side of rational theology, but who, instead of promoting destructive criticism, seek rather to emphasise the imperishable truth contained in the Scriptures. Their genealogy might be traced even directly to Coleridge and Erskine.

The first is Julius Charles Hare.¹ He was descended from an old bishop of Chichester who wrote on the difficulties and dangers of interpreting Scripture with a view to inculcating the value of tradition. He was also related to Jonathan Shipley, the liberal Bishop of St Asaph, and was one of the first to whom the appellation 'Broad Church,' was applied. As a theologian he strove to prevent the divorce of the spiritual from the intellectual, and to restore the true relation of the Tree of Knowledge to the Tree of Life.¹ He combined the results of German criticism with the fervour of Evangelicalism. Though a strong Protestant, he was yet a teacher of development. This does not mean that we are to add to the Scriptures or take away from them, but that 'truth in Scripture is set before us by example, by the utterance of principles in the germ, not by the enumeration of a formal dogmatic system, according to which the thoughts of men were to be cast and rubricated for ever after.'² Theology is progressive just as science is, and the progress is the work of the Spirit showing the things of Christ.

¹ B. 1795, D. 1855.

² Mission of the Comforter, 183.

To the work of the Holy Spirit, Hare devoted a volume of sermons, preached in Cambridge, with elaborate notes. He thought the old divines of the school of Hammond limited the gift of the Holy Spirit to the baptised. This was a meagre theology, but they were sober men compared with 'the air-blown phantoms which have recently dazzled and bewildered so many.' Of all of them it may be said that they appear 'to concentrate and condense the operations of the Spirit into a single magical movement, an electric transmuting flash, and continually disregard the perpetual abiding influences and operations.¹' The rivers of living water are the inward gifts of the Spirit, not the outward. They are not even the miraculous, which some of our divines wrongly suppose to be the highest, a supposition which would make the Jewish Church have more of the Spirit than the Christian. Since Arminianism began to prevail in the Church of England very few have believed in an abiding Spirit. Bishop Bull is mentioned as an exception. Of South it is said that he scarcely admitted any Holy Ghost 'since the miraculous gifts' till the restoration of Charles II. Stillingfleet and Warburton thought that the prophecies of the Spirit in Isaiah were fulfilled in the Apostles, and that the fountain then opened is the source of the rivers which have been preserved in Holy Scripture. The dread of Puritanism and enthusiasm tends to ignore or deny the existence of a living present Spirit.

The writers against enthusiasm in the last century spoke often, in spite of themselves, of a Holy Ghost. As members of the Church of England they could scarcely fail to do otherwise. The Liturgy continually speaks of a Holy Ghost, not merely in the inspiration of Scripture, but in the Sacraments, and in governing and sanctifying the whole body of the Church. Those who openly proclaimed their faith in a present Comforter were treated as men full of new wine. They were mocked, persecuted, and even cast out of the Church. Bishop Lavington wrote a book against enthusiasm as a quality fit only for Methodists and Papists. No severer sentence could have been pronounced on the Church of England. Even Heber, who made the promise of the Holy

¹ p. 253.

Spirit the subject of his Bampton Lectures, could find no other fulfilment than in the gift to the Church of the inspired Scriptures. Yet it appears from his other writings that he really believed in a present and powerful operation of the Spirit.

The party represented by Newman spoke more about the Spirit than the older divines, but this was still on the anti-Puritan lines, and tended to confine spiritual operations to outward forms. Newman had described infants just baptised as souls 'bright as the cherubim, as flames of fire rising heavenwards in sacrifice to God.' Hare did not deny a regeneration in baptism, but experience had taught him that the brightness was only momentary, and so soon passed away that in the great majority of cases it was

Like the snowfall in the river
A moment white then gone for ever.

The error he wished to avoid was that which made the work of the Spirit 'mechanical,' rather than dynamical, or as a principle of life abiding in the soul.

The year before the sermons on the Comforter, Hare preached before the same University a series of sermons on 'The Victory of Faith.' He set aside a common definition of faith, that it is an intellectual assent to propositions on the ground of testimony. We have been inundated with dissertations on the evidences of Christianity. It has been treated like any other historical fact. Witnesses were sifted and cross-examined, but without regard to the main witness, which is in the heart of the believer himself. The only witness on which a living faith in Christ could be established was left out of sight. The result was not to be wondered at, that the gospel melted away into a system of philosophical morality.

Newman had preached against justification by faith as held by the Reformers, but he proceeded on a misconception of the nature and powers of faith. Luther always insisted that faith was *fiducia*, trust. It does not belong to the province of reason, though it can always be justified to reason. It is not submission to a blind authority. The word of God finds an answer in that voice that rises from the depths of man's soul.

This view of faith corresponded to the doctrine of the Spirit as a dynamical influence. The rational theology, which once prevailed in the Church of England, was the death of religious life. They who craved for the living gospel were fed with husks, and those who held a more vital faith were called fanatics, enthusiasts, but the doctrine they preached was not opposed to reason. The objects of faith are not beyond the reach of reason, but beyond the reach of sight.¹

Hare was a great admirer of Luther. He wrote a vindication of him, answering charges made by Newman, Hallam, and Sir William Hamilton, charges which are the common stock of the enemies of Luther. The first was Antinomianism. St Paul had to vindicate himself from the same accusation, and so have many who have proclaimed those heights and depths of Christian truth which are in St Paul's Epistles. It does not seem possible for some persons to see that St Paul does not make void the law, but establishes the law. Passages from Luther are often quoted separated from the context, and it is generally forgotten that the good works which he strongly condemns are the ceremonial works prescribed by the Church. Newman's condemnation of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, is founded on a misunderstanding of what is meant by faith. With Luther there was no true faith if not followed by good works, that is righteousness of life. Faith is trust in Christ, and cannot abide in those who live after the flesh. Where there is mortal sin, there is no peace, that is such faith as justifies.

The often quoted words of Luther where he says, 'Sin boldly, but still more boldly believe and rejoice in Christ,' are in a letter to Melancthon. We have not the letter, and do not know the connection which would probably make the passage clear. A clue to it is found in the commentary on the Galatians, where something approaching to it is used to set forth the fulness of grace. The tone and temper of the age encouraged paradoxical expressions, which to us are startling and offensive.

Hare defined his position as distinct from that of the two dogmatic parties in the Church. The one he called Bibliolaters and the other Ecclesiolaters. The first ascribed

¹ p. 79.

mechanical inspiration to a book, the other much of the same thing to a church. It is the tendency of the carnal mind to attach itself to the letter, the form, the dregs instead of the free living spirit.¹ The promise of Christ's presence was not confined to the clergy, but was to the faithful people in all countries and ages. In the same sermons referring to the Tractarian heresy, he said, 'You would join with me to purge our Church from the remains of the Judaizing superstition which would wrap the free spirit of the Gospel in swathing bands of forms and ceremonies.' The Church was not to be identified with Episcopacy. Hooker was commended for the cautious position which he advocated that Episcopacy was not contrary to Scripture. Christianity was altogether independent of forms of ecclesiastical government. 'In Christ Jesus neither Episcopacy availeth anything nor non-Episcopacy but a new creature.'² Hare lamented that Baxter, 'one of the wisest and holiest of men the Spirit of God ever purified for the edification of His people,' was lost to the Church, and Wesley, who lifted up his voice 'to admonish us that the Temple of the Lord is an empty shell unless the Spirit of the Lord be dwelling in it.'³

Professor Maurice even more than Hare was the disciple of Coleridge and Erskine. His theology is often misunderstood, but sometimes light comes upon it with the help of Erskine. In relation to the Tractarian theology it may be said to reject the authority of the Church while attaching great importance to the Church. In relation to the Evangelical party, it may be said to lean more to the internal authority of the Bible than the external, though shrinking from the conclusions of the Bible critics. It saw in Christianity

¹ Sermon on, 'Lo, I am with you always,' etc. ² Ibid.

³ It is interesting to find in Hare's Charges that he advocated many of the changes for which the Tractarian movement has had the credit. He was one of the first to denounce the square pews, to abolish baptismal fees, and fees for bringing the dead into the Church. He also advocated the performance of baptism during the public service. He lamented that the Church had left the manufacturing districts to the Nonconformists, and now that activity had begun to appear it was in connection with Romanising tendencies which astonished him as much as would have done the restoration of the worship of Jupiter or of Odin.

an unfolding of truth to the soul endowed with capacity to perceive it. It used the Evangelical phraseology, though it often presented what is reckoned the orthodox doctrine in an inverted form. Christianity was found to be what man needs. It was not elaborated out of the human consciousness, but it was adapted to man's condition.

Maurice was the son of a Unitarian minister whose children all left the community in which they were born. He had been baptised by his father who used the formula 'in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' At the age of twenty-six, not satisfied that baptism by a Unitarian was valid for admission into the Christian Church, he was re-baptised, being led to this, he believed, by the Spirit of God. At Oxford he came partially under the influence of the Tractarians, though never at one with them. His first publication was an anonymous pamphlet called 'Subscription no Bondage'¹ It was a defence of the practice of requiring subscription for matriculation at the University.² The Articles were regarded not as a test of faith but as a help to education. They were the terms or principles on which the teacher agreed to teach and the learner to be taught. They were not, as some supposed, a test of conformity to the Church of England. They are imposed on those who are already communicants. It was objected that if not a test of membership there is no reason for their being imposed at the University. They are confessions of faith like other confessions, and were intended to be such by the compilers. The answer is that the compilers of these Articles approved and ratified other Confessions, that is the Creeds. The subject matter is the same, but the object is different. Bacon's *Novum Organum* is of the same kind as the Articles. In each there is a set of dictatorial propositions to warn students against certain alleged superstitions. It is shown from Anthony à Wood that the Articles were primarily intended as instruments of education. They were adopted by the University not 'to exclude Papists' but to root out Popery

¹ By Rusticus, 1835.

² The title was 'The Practical Advantages offered by the Thirty-Nine Articles as Guides in all Branches of Academical Education.'

as a heretical pravity from the minds of the people. The Articles are imposed on the clergy, not the laity, because there is a stipulation between the clergy and the State as to what the clergy are to teach. This was a result of the Reformation which stirred the national life by its separation from the Roman supremacy. The writer afterwards testified his willingness to sign any petition from either clergymen or laymen for the entire abolition of subscription to Articles of Religion.¹

The first work of any importance which Maurice wrote was on the 'Kingdom of Christ,' or principles, ordinances, and constitution of the Catholic Church, in letters addressed to a member of the Society of Friends. This was a defence of the visible Church, and might have been written by a strong Churchman against the shortcomings of those who had lost the idea of the Church as a visible community. It was assumed that the Quakers had no idea of a Church except as the invisible body of believers, or a particular body assembled in one place. The Quakers through neglect of the sacraments have borne but a feeble ineffective witness to the existence of the spiritual kingdom. In opposition to this it was maintained that God had established a real kingdom in the world. This kingdom was based on principles which cannot be undermined by the inconsistency of those who belong to it. Being based on permanent principles, it must be a permanent institution. It does not seem that this book was ever noticed by any member of the Society of Friends, and the reason probably is that none of them ever understood it as addressed to them.

For Maurice's theology, we must go first to the 'Theological Essays.' They were addressed to Unitarians. In the Dedication to Tennyson, it was intimated that the theology of the 'Essays was one which corresponded to the deepest thoughts and feelings of human beings, and this was found to be the theology of the Creeds, the Articles of which most offend Unitarians.' They object to the character of God as set forth in orthodox theology, and set over against it the fact that God is love. The Essays are to show that according to

¹ Letter to Stanley.

the orthodox Creeds the character of God is love. These creeds are not mere dogmas, or theories about God, but declarations of His mind and will, and of His acts towards us. The old Unitarians did not see more in sin than the transgression of a rule. They had no idea of man being in a wrong state, having torment within himself. They did not speak to man as a sinner. They had no message to those who sought deliverance, they told men to repent, and they would be forgiven, but what men wanted to know was how to repent and what was to be forgiven. It is true the Church in the last century had acted in the same spirit, but this was because it did not much believe the creeds and the prayers of the Prayer Book. But they were there, and they were witnesses of an Infinite Sin and an Infinite Love.

The object was to vindicate orthodox theology from the objections of Unitarians. The result was that both Orthodox and Unitarians turned upon the writer and repudiated his representations of what they believed. Starting with the idea of sin, he finds it inwrought in every fibre of man's nature. We cannot get rid of the sense of it, and not merely is human nature depraved, but there is an evil spirit tempting men to evil acts. There is, however, a righteousness in man. Christ the righteous Lord is in man. He is the source of all good actions, none of which are, as some have said, 'splendid sins'. This righteous Lord is the Son of God.

The doctrine of the Incarnation is accepted for three reasons. The first is that we feel the impossibility of knowing the Absolute and Invisible God as we feel we need to know Him, and crave to know Him. The second is that we do not perceive how we can recognise a perfect Son of God such as we need and crave for, unless He were in all points tempted like as we are. The third is, that we ask of God a redemption not for a few persons from actual evil tendencies, but for humanity from all the plagues with which it is tormented.¹

Objections had been made to sacrifice and atonement, as against our sense of right and wrong, but such objections were not really against the theology of the old creeds, but only against popular and scholastic explanations of it. In the atonement Christ shared the sufferings of those whose head

¹ p. 102.

He is.¹ The atonement had its source in the love of the Father; He sent His son. They are one in will and purpose as well as in substance. Christ bore sin, not the penalty. He came to take away sin. That the law must execute itself is the common argument for the suffering of Christ, but the law does not execute itself if one against whom it is not directed interposes to bear its punishment. God was satisfied not with the punishment of sin, but with the purity and graciousness of the Son.²

Christ died and rose again from the dead. The resurrection was real, it was a bodily resurrection, and not merely a spiritual. His body saw no corruption. This interprets our resurrection. It will not be the gathering together of the material particles at some future day. This is a belief worse than the Romish worship of reliques, but the same in kind. The Adam dies and sees corruption, but the new nature which we have in Christ continues. He is the resurrection and the life. The body does not sleep till some future day. The resurrection is now. Body and spirit are not separate units. Adam is the source of individuality, disease, death. The Adam dies, but the Christ who is the root of man's nature lives. The foundation for a Universal Church is that Christ is in man. He will quicken the spirit and deliver the soul and the body from death. The Son of Man came to claim men as spiritual beings, as inheritors of the spiritual kingdom. Baptism is the declaration that we are constituted in Christ. The resurrection and ascension of Christ are not extraordinary and anomalous events, but events which exhibit eternal laws and vindicate the true order and constitution of man's existence.

The historical interest of the 'Essays' centres in the last. For this the writer lost his professorship at King's College. That he was misunderstood is now the universal verdict, but the greatest of his admirers have wished that he had been gifted with the faculty of clear expression. His thoughts are definite enough, when once we have understood them, but to do this we have to 'undergirdle the ship using helps.' It happens that the last Essay is about the clearest, and need not have been misunderstood, especially by those who

¹ p. 145.

² p. 147.

had entered into the spirit of the previous Essays. The objections of the Unitarians are supposed to have been answered. It has been shown that the Trinity is a rational doctrine, that it manifests God as love, and that all the popular objections to the orthodox creeds, usually fall not upon the creeds themselves but upon misrepresentations of the doctrine of the creeds. Now comes the objection that the God of orthodox theology cannot be love so long as that theology teaches that there is everlasting punishment after death. Some have affixed one meaning to the word translated everlasting or eternal, when it refers to blessedness, and another when it refers to punishment, but this was arbitrary. Whatever the meaning is, it is the same, whether applied to life or to death. Some define eternal as without beginning and without end. It is so applied to God, but it cannot have the same meaning when applied to bliss or punishment, for these have a beginning. We must take another view of eternity. It is not a continuation of time. It has nothing to do with duration. The spiritual world is not subject to temporal conditions. What we see is temporal, what we do not see is eternal. Eternal life is to have the knowledge of God and of Christ. Eternal death is to be without that knowledge. If we say that eternity in relation to God has nothing to do with time, or duration, we are bound to say that in reference to life or punishment, it has nothing to do with time or duration. Perdition is loss, the loss of an eternal good, which God had revealed to His creatures, of which He had even put them in possession. He wills all men to be saved, He maintains a fight with evil and must do so, while evil exists. 'I am obliged to believe in an abyss of love which is deeper than the abyss of death. I dare not lose faith in that love, I sink into death, eternal death if I do. I must feel that this love is encompassing the universe.' Those who condemned Maurice supposed that he taught that impenitent unbelieving sinners would ultimately be saved, but his argument is quite free from such an inference, for sin and impenitence constitute perdition.

The idea of revelation in Maurice's theology is different from that of either of the Church parties, which rested in some way on external authority. When Professor Mansel was

Bampton Lecturer in 1858, his subject was 'The Limits of Religious Thought.' On Sir William Hamilton's doctrine of the unknowableness of the Absolute or Unconditioned, he erected an argument for the unknowableness of God. Revelation was merely regulative, to be received on authority because we had no internal faculty to judge of its contents. This was diametrically opposed to all that Maurice had taught. He entered into controversy with the Bampton Lecturer. In the inquiry 'What is Revelation' he made out that it was a direct manifestation of the infinite God, that God speaks to man's spirit. Neither Scripture nor tradition, nor both of them make revelation. It is the unveiling not of a system, nor of a religion, but of God. Christ is the visible image of the Invisible. What the Son is the Father is.

A regulative revelation, which makes religion a mere rule of life, does not satisfy the cravings of man's heart. Puritanism and Methodism give the satisfaction which could not be found in the outward rule. They appealed to the sense of sin, and showed that men might be partakers of the divine nature. For this it was not necessary to know the right doctrine of God's relation to the world, any more than to feel the sun's light and heat is it necessary to know the right doctrine of the heavenly bodies. Maurice argued that Mansel's view of Revelation was destructive of all religion which went beyond outward rules, that it made all who had deep spiritual feelings or divine intuitions to be mere enthusiasts, that there was no such thing as being taught of God. But we have within us a deep conviction that if we cannot rise above our conceptions we can know nothing. Mansel aimed at Hegel and the German philosophers and Mystics, but the argument is equally valid against Augustine, Thomas à Kempis, and Leighton, yea, against the Prayer Book and even the Bible itself. We preach to the poor just because they have the faculty to receive truth, which by Mansel's argument they have not. It is quite independent of the faculty to form notions, judge of opinions, or criticise documents. Kant was consistent in believing in a moral sense above the conditions of human intelligence, while he resolved time and space into forms of human consciousness. He did so because he believed that moral principles are not

forms of consciousness, but have to do with that which is above the conditions of the intellect.

The name of Charles Kingsley will ever be associated with that of Maurice. The men were essentially unlike. The only point of agreement was that Kingsley took the theology of Maurice as his own, he was avowedly his disciple. Kingsley was Maurice made easy—Maurice put into practice with his theology as an applied science. Maurice's doctrine that Christ is in man, that man is constituted in the Son of God, that the Adam nature is an intrusion, and that we are sons of God and ought to realise our sonship, was by Kingsley transformed into the formula, that the world is God's and not the devil's, though for a time the devil has a footing in it. A corollary from this was the doctrine, that what is right in nature is right. In this way the constitution of the world is vindicated, with all its misery and sin and wretchedness. It is in itself right, and this will finally be manifest. Kingsley had the individuality of genius and was not confined to the boundaries of mere theology. He was orthodox in the sense that his master was, and like him he became enamoured of the old creeds, and especially that which bears the name of St Athanasius. He had little sympathy with the Bible critics, was devoted to the Prayer Book, and he even spent his eloquence in extolling the merits of the Church catechism.¹

Frederick W. Robertson² may be classed with Hare, Maurice and Kingsley, because of their agreement on the chief points of doctrine and the general interpretation of Christianity. Otherwise there is no individual connection. Robertson's development was independent and spontaneous. He had been educated among the Evangelical party, to whom he owed the spirit of earnestness and devotion, which relieve his sermons from the dry atmosphere of the merely rational preacher. At Oxford during the Tractarian crisis he did not escape its influence but resisted its principles. He clung to Evangelicalism, but that became gradually transformed. In Robertson's theology, Christ is the centre. His devotion to Christ is intense, earnest, rational. He was strong on the doctrine of the Trinity in its strict Nicene or Athanasian sense, but while he held by Christ's divinity he

¹ Sermons *passim*.

² B. 1816, d. 1853.

did not lose sight of His perfect humanity. There was no mixing of the two natures together or modifying of the one by the other. Christ was God omniscient and omnipotent, but equally true was the other fact that Christ was man, with the limitations of humanity. To understand how Christ is both God and man may be beyond our capacity, but we ought not to let His divinity deprive us of the precious humanities of His life. Jesus was a child like other children. He grew in wisdom as He grew in stature, and as other children grow. He knew his sheep not because he was omniscient, but by the same faculty that the sheep knew Him. He could read men because he knew what was in man, not by the power of His divinity, but by the perfection of his humanity.¹ Baptism was explained not as making us children of God, but as the public or formal declaration of our sonship. The Queen was heir to the throne before she became Queen, but the coronation was the act by which she was declared Queen. Christ died for us. He died for our sins. He laid down His life in defence of the sheep. He exposed Himself to their dangers, made His life one with theirs. He did not bear the wrath of God. The Father was not angry with the Son, but the Son came into collision with the world's evil and had to bear its punishment as it had to be borne by others. By becoming man He identified Himself with men, and as man He had to suffer. In this sense He bore the penalty of sin, the sin of others.² The Bible is the Word of God, but it is also the Word of man. As the first it is perfect, as the second imperfect. The latter is from the nature of the case. Scientific correctness would have been an impediment to Revelation when it was given. A cosmogony in terms of absolute truth would have caused the authority of the book to be rejected. No one would have believed a writer who said that the earth went round the sun.

¹ See Sermons on Jesus growing in Wisdom and on the Good Shepherd.

² See Sermon on Caiaphas' view of Vicarious Sacrifice.

CHAPTER XIV

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

TRACTARIANISM relied on Church authority. It did not maintain an infallible Church, but its tendency was in that direction. When the Reformers left the Church of Rome they took the Bible for their standard. Some say they took the Bible alone, others say the Bible as interpreted by Catholic antiquity. The advance of Bible criticism and other sciences demanded a revision of the position in which the Bible was regarded by both parties. This had been going on silently almost since the century began, but chiefly as the work of isolated scholars, who generally earned the reputation and shared the fate of heretics. By the publication of 'Essays and Reviews,' it was made manifest that not merely obscure heretics had accepted the results of Bible criticism, but men who either held or were likely to hold positions of influence in the Church and the Universities. The volume was the work of seven men who had no plan or agreement, but were independent of each other. The only thing they had in common was that they were to handle their subjects freely and without bias or prejudice.¹

The first Essay was by Dr Frederick Temple, headmaster of Rugby. The subject was 'The Education of the Human Race.' The substance of the Essay was a sermon which had

¹ It was in reality the last of a set of volumes called Oxford Essays and Cambridge Essays. The publisher wished to close the series with representatives of the theology held by liberal minds in the Universities.

been preached at Oxford. That Christ came in the fulness of time, that is, at the stage of the world's existence in which the purpose of the Advent could be best served, seemed a harmless proposition. The heresy was discovered in the illustrations and was probably first suggested by its connection with the other essays. It may also have been remembered that Lessing wrote a treatise with the same title. In the education of the race the great nations of the old world were, so to speak, different classes. The lesson of the Jews was religious truth and purity of life. The Romans learned order and organisation, the Greeks science and art, while the Asiatics were disciplined by the turmoil of life to long for rest. The human race is compared to a colossal man which has a youth, a childhood, and a manhood. It was first taught by laws, then by examples, finally by principles. Christ came when the world was prepared to feel the power of His presence. Had He delayed till now it would have been hard for us to recognise His divinity, for the faculty of faith is turned inwards. The form of the Bible answers to this education. It does not consist of precise statements of facts. It is not an outer law but a history of religious life. Its office is not to override, but to evoke conscience. The immediate work of our day is the study of the Bible.

The second Essay was 'A Review of Bunsen's Biblical Researches,' by Dr Rowland Williams, Vicar of Broadchalk, Wilts. The writer made it the occasion of setting forth the conclusions to which German critics had come as to the Bible, its history and its interpretation. Bunsen's researches confirmed the more liberal criticism which traces Revelation historically within the sphere of nature and humanity. This brought Scripture within the sphere of nature, and denied or seemed to deny the supernatural. Hitherto Revelation was understood as something outside or above the sphere of nature. When the record of creation in Genesis was taken literally, creation was supposed to be supernatural, an interference of the Deity, but since the discoveries of geology the idea of interference has been vanishing. The age of criticism has come. It is applied to Gentile history and that of the Hebrews cannot escape. Here the second Essay unconsciously connects itself with the first. It finds a common ground for

Jew and Gentile history. It finds that the ancient religions appeal to the better side of our nature, and that their constituents are parts of the instrumentality of Revelation.

If Revelation falls within the sphere of history and nature we do not expect the Bible records to be infallible. To vindicate the unity of the human race, Bunsen asked twenty thousand years, the Bible only gives six. Jacob's descendants who came out of Egypt required a longer time for their increase to two millions than the Book of Genesis allows. The Exodus was a struggle carried on by human means, and the avenger who slew the first born may have been the Bedouin host. The passage through the Red Sea has more of poetry than history. The Bible is the expression of devout reason, and to be read with reason in freedom. Righteous men of old put their trust in a righteous God, who did not require offerings of blood. The fierce ritual of Syria taught Abraham to slay his son, but he found that God preferred mercy to sacrifice. He listened to the voice which speaks within.

Prophecy was not prognostication, but the preaching of righteousness. The predictions believed to be in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New have but a shadowy fulfilment. Bishop Butler foresaw the possibility that every prophecy in the Old Testament might have its elucidation in contemporaneous history. Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic. Others restricted this character to four. Paley ventures to quote only one. The deliverer from Bethlehem was to be a contemporary shield against the Assyrian. 'Kiss ye the son' in Psalm II would be better rendered 'worship purely.' 'Mighty God' applied to the child spoken of by Isaiah, might perhaps mean simply strong or mighty One. And the Virgin's child to be called Emmanuel was to be born in the reign of Ahaz. The 'man of sorrows' may have been Jeremiah or collective Israel. Some of what are called the prophecies of Daniel, relate to events which happened before or during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The Bible is the written voice of the Congregation. The first Essayist said there was a moral conscience which the Bible did not override. The second spoke of a 'verifying faculty,'

or witness within us. No external evidence can prove the truth of narratives inherently incredible or precepts evidently wrong.

The third Essay was 'On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity.' The author was Baden Powell, Savilian Professor of Geometry. This Essay is hard to follow, and has been differently understood. The writer died immediately after its publication, so that he could not clear up any obscurities, nor defend himself from the reproaches that had been cast upon him. The scope of the Essay may be indicated by what Coleridge said about external evidence, which is called an accessory, and therefore liable to change with the changes of opinion and the advance of knowledge. Modern evidences did not exist before the fifteenth century. They were specially required by Protestants who wanted something definite and substantial. Our present logical arguments are the issue of the Deist controversy. Grotius and Paley appealed to miracles, but that kind of evidence is now partially neglected. Some make the test of Christianity to be the union of miracles and doctrine. False prophets may work miracles, and an angel from heaven may preach another gospel. The question of miracles is purely a question which relates to the physical, and in nature we can find no trace of interference. Creation is only another name for our ignorance of the mode of production. For miracles we must go beyond nature and beyond science. Any such phenomena in nature would only prove extraordinary natural effects. The conclusion is, that Christianity rests on faith, not argument, not on the wisdom of man but in the power of God. The old Deists had used this argument ironically, but there is every reason for believing that the writer of this Essay used it seriously. With him as with Coleridge, Christianity was its own evidence. Its truth cannot be demonstrated by propositions, but rests on the assurance of faith.

The fourth Essay was on 'The National Church.' Henry Bristow Wilson, Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts, advocated a National Church wide enough to embrace all creeds. At a conference in Geneva of persons holding evangelical sentiments, a difference emerged as to whether the Church should be limited to the converted and the orthodox, or left open to

admit the unconverted and heretical. One speaker, whose subject was the reign of Constantine, condemned what he called the Pagan union of Church and State, by which multitudes are reckoned Christians who are so only in name. Another speaker, whose subject was the age of Augustine and Theodosius, defended this national or multitudinist principle. It prevailed in the Jewish theocracy. Christianity had its greatest victories under it. The three thousand added to the Church on the day of Pentecost could not be supposed 'converted' in the modern sense, and moreover, when a church was founded on individualism, it fell back on multitudinism.

The Church of England was on the eve of great changes. It had seen many in past times and it need not now fear to adjust old things to new conditions. Millions in England are persistently absent from all worship. They recoil from the doctrines taught at church and chapel. They distrust the old arguments for Revelation. They have misgivings as to the extent of the authority of the Scriptures, and it is well known that many societies exist for the revision of the Prayer Book and Formularies of the National Church.

It is now found that there are great nations whose very existence was not contemplated by the Bible records. We cannot suppose that faith in Christ is required of those who never heard His name. They will be dealt with equitably. The distinction commonly made between covenanted and uncovenanted mercies is a distinction without a difference. It implies a denial of the justice of the Supreme Being. If Scripture writers say that the heathen who never heard of Christ are not to be saved, this is only an expression of their private opinion.

The argument which used to be urged in evidence of the truth of Christianity from the spread of the gospel has no validity. Not more than one-fourth of the world is, or ever has been, Christian. It used also to be urged as evidence that Christ came at the time when the Roman world was in hopeless corruption. But a stronger necessity existed for renovation in China and India. We are comforted by the reflection that both Jesus and Paul have taught, that all men

everywhere will be judged according to their privileges and the use they have made of them.

The corruption of the Church had been ascribed to the union of the Church and State under Constantine, but it is doubtful if the corruption after his reign was greater than it had been before. At no time have Christians approached their ideals. Moral precepts have always been above doctrinal statements. The words of Jesus are a great contrast, for instance, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, though even there the moral bearing is not overlooked. Jesus was more severe towards the moral defects of the Pharisees than towards the doctrinal defects of the Sadducees. Some of St Paul's converts who had probably belonged to the latter sect, did not believe in the resurrection. Their Christianity was in following the moral spirit of Jesus. The multitudinist Churches of St Paul tended to become National Churches.

Constantine sanctioned the multitudinist principle, but he at the same time inaugurated the opposite, which is that of doctrinal limitation. Neither Calvinistic nor hierarchical Churches are of the same character as National Churches. The last need not be tied to any particular forms or doctrines. The Church of England like all Protestant Churches professes to rest solely on the Word of God, but this phrase when applied to the Scriptures begs many questions. In that which may be called the pivot Article of the Church, the Bible is not called the Word of God, nor is there any suggestion of its being supernaturally inspired. We must freely recognise the extent of the human element in the Bible, before we can frankly recognise the divine. The same freedom of opinion which is claimed by every citizen should be granted to every churchman. The XXXIX Articles may be left as the ultimate law of the Church not to be contradicted, but subscription should be abolished. A National Church is necessary for the completion of the national life, and its chief concern should be with the ethical development of its members. The religion of Jesus is not a theology of the intellect. He did not require unanimity of speculative doctrine to the stifling of the Christian life. It is not the business of a state to develop speculative truths, that must be left to the schools of philosophy.

There should be room in a National Church for those who take the Scriptures literally, and for those who interpret them allegorically. Many things in the Bible, as the descent of all men from Adam and Eve, or the birth of Jesus in the city of David, may not be taken as facts, but as embodying ideas. This is called ideology. The history has its origin in the idea. In the conclusion of this Essay a hope was expressed that the many rudimentary spirits or germinal souls in the Church who are not ripe at the hour of death for entering on a higher career, may yet 'find refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent to repose, or be quickened into higher life, in the ages to come.'

The fifth Essay was by a layman, C. W. Goodwin. His subject was the Mosaic Cosmogony. The main argument is that there are two records of Creation in Genesis. The second beginning at ii, 4 may be poetical, but not the first which does profess to teach and convey at least some physical truth, and taking the words in their plain meaning, it gives a view of the universe adverse to that of modern science. As soon as it was discovered that the earth went round the sun, the fact was established that the Bible writers did not speak scientifically. Since that time geology has shown that the record in Genesis is of no scientific value.

The sixth Essay on 'The Tendencies of Religious Thought in England from 1688-1750,' was written by Mark Pattison, afterwards Master of Lincoln College, Oxford. The subject is indicated in the title. The Reformation set aside the authority of the Church and turned to the Bible alone. The Laudian divines tried to substitute the authority of the English Church for that which had been set aside at the Reformation. Some Puritans and some Churchmen turned to the inner light by way of reaction from 'the Laudian theory.' This inner light fell into discredit through the extravagances which it sanctioned. The authority theory of the National Church was left to the Nonjurors at the Revolution. After that time reason began to assert its supremacy. With the Deistical writers and those who replied to them 'reason' was the supreme arbiter in religion. This continued till 1830, when its vigour began to decline in the reaction against Reform, or in other words under the influence of the Oxford move-

ment. The chief object in the first half of the eighteenth century was to show that there was nothing in the contents of Revelation which was not agreeable to reason. In the latter half the object was narrowed to the production of evidences. The Christian Religion became something to be proved, but what was to be done with it after that was not much thought about. Our present position has been influenced by the religious thought of those who have preceded us. It would be hard to say on what basis Revelation is now supposed to rest, whether on authority, on the inward light, on reason, on self-evidencing Scripture, or the combination of all the four.

The seventh Essay was by Benjamin Jowett, Professor of Greek, afterwards Master of Balliol College, Oxford. The subject was the Interpretation of Scripture. All Christians receive the Old and New Testaments as sacred writings, but there are great differences of opinion as to the mode of interpreting them. The causes of this variety are often found in party interests. Some follow the Fathers and some the Reformers. No other book has been subjected to the same variety of interpretation. The text of no ancient author has been treated as the text of Scripture has been. Alterations have been introduced often on no principle whatever. Editors used any imperfect or mis-written copies that fell in their way. At length in 1624 an edition was invested with authority, not because it was perfect, but because perfect accuracy could not be attained.

The Bible has been interpreted and translated on principles that are applied to no other book. It has been made to mean anything which the interpreter wished it to mean. It is encrusted with the remains of dogmas, systems, controversies, but the book itself remains the same amid all the interpretations. Almost all Christians call it inspired, but the meaning of inspiration has been variously explained. Some make it superintendence, some suggestion, some infallibility in matters of doctrine and facts, while others limit it to doctrine only. For the view of infallible or supernatural inspiration, there is no foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. We should learn what inspiration is from the examination of Scripture. We should not make a theory like what is claimed for the in-

fallibility of the Papal Church. Any true doctrine of inspiration must conform to all the well ascertained facts of history and science. Then there will be no need of elaborate reconciliations of Revelation and Science. As the idea of nature enlarges so will the idea of Revelation.

We should be ready to give up spurious texts. We should not seek to adapt the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the creeds, nor attribute to the Apostles the notions of Christian truth which belong to later times. We should not make too much of texts which seem to favour our own views, and leave others which make for the contrary unnoticed or unexplained. Those who receive the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity often forget this text.¹ 'Of that hour knoweth no man neither the Son, but the Father.' Ambrose, doubted the genuineness of texts which he did not like. We are scarcely fair to the Predestinarians when we seek to deprive them of their real standing ground in the third and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. The Scripture should be interpreted like any other book. It has one true meaning and not many. When interpreted by the same canons as other books, it will still remain unlike any other book. Scripture should be interpreted from itself. Every book has its characteristics from the age in which it was written, and the character of the mind of the writer, just as in secular literature. Paul and James must not be violently harmonised. The application of Scripture is not to be confounded with its interpretation. Illustration is not argument.

The 'Essays and Reviews' were at first but little noticed. Attention was drawn to them by an article in the *Westminster Review*,² entitled 'Neo-Christianity.' Here they were described as making a new epoch, as the latest phase of religion, and as claiming a place in the record of religious thought. The axioms of science and the results of criticism which this Review had long advocated were now said to be preached in the citadels of orthodoxy, and it was insisted that they be pushed to their legitimate conclusions. The book was said to repudiate miracles, inspiration, Mosaic history and the authority of the Bible. The writers had

¹ Mark xiii, 32.

² Oct. 1860. The writer was Frederic Harrison, the Positivist.

declared that they were all independent and no one responsible for what another said, but the reviewer treated them as associated thinkers sending forth their manifesto.

The first Essay was the keynote to the whole. It reduced the teaching of the Hebrews to the level of that of Greece and Rome. Its idea of a colossal man to be educated was taken from Auguste Comte, and its main results were simply monotheism and the principle of purity, the latter probably borrowed from F. W. Newman. The second Essay subjected the Hebrew annals to the remorseless criticism which had been applied to Gentile histories. The words are put into the mouth of Bunsen, but it is Teucer discharging his arrows behind the shield of Ajax. While Dr Temple reduced the national position of the Hebrews to the level of the Romans, Dr Williams reduced the outward authority of the Bible to the level of Livy. In the third Essay the whole supernatural element is eliminated from belief. The fourth makes the gospels not perfectly genuine and authentic. Many things may be taken allegorically, such as the transfiguration and the opening of the eyes of the blind. While the facts are not admitted, the ideas remain. This is called ideology. The fifth makes the Mosaic cosmogony the speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton. The seventh expands and illustrates the principle of the first.

From one end of the book to the other the same process goes on. Facts are idealised, dogmas are transformed. Creeds are discredited as human and provisional. The authority of the Church and of the Bible to establish any doctrine is discarded; the moral teaching of the Gospel remains. The book contains fatal concessions distorted into specious apology, and of these the strongest instances are in Dr Temple's Essay. The result of the whole is that the literature of the Bible is made provokingly unreliable. The Bible is reduced to the position of the Apocrypha.¹ The Essayists have discarded the veracity of the oracles, and yet think that mankind will consult them for the poetry of

¹ In criticising this article, Dean Stanley ascribed to the writer a malignant or sinister intention. This was afterwards withdrawn when the writer assured the Dean that there was no such intention.

the responses. Scientific criticism has undermined the whole framework of doctrine, and just as old polytheism ended in the visions of Neo-Platonism, so to Christianity is left nothing but the Christian life.

The claim of the *Westminster Review* to identify the position of the Essayists with its own, alarmed orthodox churchmen of the two great parties. An article in the *Quarterly Review*¹ increased the excitement. The logical ultimate of the Essays was pronounced to be infidelity if not atheism. Dr Temple's religious tone was pleasing but feeble. The plaintive utterances of Jowett were earnest and often loving, but Powell's atheism was scarcely veiled. Wilson's laxity and scepticism were open, while the flippancy of Williams was daring.² All of them had abandoned the Church's ancient position of certainty and truth. The last six developed the errors which existed in germ in the first. Wilson was asked if he followed Strauss in explaining some things ideologically, why he did not follow him in all. If we do not take the Bible record of an ancestral head we lose St Paul's argument that in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. The writers were more or less infidels, sceptics, atheists, and were guilty of moral dishonesty in retaining the status and emoluments of clergymen of the Church of England.

This article was followed by one in the *Edinburgh Review*,³ which was intended to calm the troubled sea. The combination was condemned as leading to misapprehension and inimical to the just consideration of the subjects discussed. Moreover the book was too negative. In old times such books were written in Latin, but here as in the case of the second Essayist we have the conclusions of German theologians thrown in the face of a public which

¹ Jan. 1861. S. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford.

² Notwithstanding the hard things said against Powell it is ascertained that a few days before his sudden death he preached, worshipped and communicated in St Andrews, Well Street, where he usually attended. So unconscious was he of atheism that he had just asked permission to deliver the Bampton Lectures. Stanley's Essays p. 65.

³ April 1861. By Dean Stanley at that time Prof. of Eccles. Hist. at Oxford.

have never heard of such things before. Powell's Essay had no direct relation to the others, and ought with Goodwin's to be treated as practically defunct. Dr Temple's was in substance a sermon preached at Oxford, and heard with approbation and enthusiasm. The subject was Christ's having come in the fulness of time, and the only fault of the argument was that it was as old as St Paul. The dangerous tendencies of Pattison's Essay could only be discovered by the lens of the microscope used for detecting heresy. The tone of Williams was flippant and contemptuous.¹ Wilson's defence of a National church was powerful yet often rash. But taking the volume as a whole it really contained nothing new. It was no new Christianity, no new reformation, and no new religion. It made no statement of doctrine or fact, with the possible exception of a few words, which had not been repeatedly set forth by divines, some of whom are regarded as luminaries of the Church. The Essayists admit no precise theory of inspiration, but there is none in our formularies. They only speak of the inspiration of devout souls, never of supernatural dictation. Another question raised by the Essays was the relative value of the external and internal evidences of Christianity. A reaction had set in in favour of the internal, and the Essayists had thrust the pendulum back, it may be with too violent a swing. In spite of all the declamation which has been made against the book, no one has been able to point out in the Essays a passage which contradicts any of the formularies of the Church. In this respect there is no collision at all to be compared with that which exists between the High Church party and the Articles, the Low Church party and the Prayer Book.

The tempest caused by the Essays continued to rage. Petitions and protests were addressed to Archbishops and Bishops. The Bishops themselves issued a manifesto. Condemnatory resolutions were passed in both Houses of Convocation. Clever men exercised their ingenuity to find fitting names for the seven Essayists. They were 'the seven stars in the new constellation,' 'the seven extinguishers of the seven lamps of the Apocalypse,' 'the seven champions not of

¹ A severer sentence was passed on Williams, but afterwards withdrawn when the Dean came to know Williams better.

Christendom,' and one parodying the title of a Greek play. 'The seven against Thebes' called the Essayists '*Septem contra Christum*, or the seven against Christ.' A rural Dean described the book as awful, avowing that he had not read it, and never would. Everywhere it was spoken against and preached against. It is recorded in the life of John Toland that a gentleman in Ireland who had ceased attending Church being asked the reason, said there was a time when he could hear something in the Church about Jesus Christ, but now there was no name heard there but that of one John Toland. So with Essays and Reviews. Bishops and curates, priests and deacons, made them the gospel for the day.

The next business was to refute them. Each party came forward with a volume. The first was called 'Aids to Faith,' edited by William Thomson, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol afterwards Archbishop of York. It was not a direct answer to the Essays taken in order, but Essays on subjects in which faith, as the title indicated, required to be aided. The first was written by Henry L. Mansel, Professor of Logic in Oxford, and afterwards Dean of St Paul's. He had chiefly in view what had been said by Baden Powell on miracles, which was that they had little value as evidence and even if believed could not be admitted to be interferences in the order of nature. The important question was their reality as supernatural facts. If this be denied, Christianity so far as it relates to the person or teaching of Christ is overthrown. This is so bound up with the miracles that they must stand or fall together. Christ appealed to miracles as the evidence of His mission. He must have known if they were really supernatural and if God has redeemed the world it is not incredible that miracles should have been wrought. The testimony of a person who works a miracle can reach to the supernatural. The objection from the uniformity of natural laws is not relevant. The uniformity only applies to certain classes of objects which have come under our observation. There are powers and properties of other objects which have not been observed. A special cause producing a special effect offers no antagonism to the general uniformity of nature. We have no right to assume the incredibility of a special cause. A personal free agent may influence the phenomena of matter. The probability therefore of a miracle

is not to be judged merely from physical but also from moral grounds. We have to consider not only the physical phenomena but the religious nature of man and his relation to God. In revealed religion we expect something different from what we see in the ordinary course of nature.

Dr William Fitzgerald, Bishop of Cork, followed with a dissertation on 'Evidences.' He defended the apologetic literature and the external evidence in opposition to those who, like Coleridge, rested mainly on the internal. The despised school of Lardner and Paley was a natural growth in history. To answer the Deists it was necessary to consider the credibility of the first witnesses, and the value of the tradition by which their testimony has been handed down to us. The success of such preachers as the Methodists did not indeed result from argument in the way of external evidence, but in the adaptation of what they preached to the necessities and the cravings of the heart. This is a fact by itself. But it is also a fact that Christianity is presented to us in the New Testament as an historical religion. It has a basis in history, and can be proved by rational, that is, external evidence.

Dr McCaul, Professor of Hebrew, King's College London, and Rector of St Magnus the Martyr, took the subject of 'Prophecy' with a view to Rowland Williams' Essay. He maintained that the Hebrew prophets did predict future events. They had the gift of prognostication. The new translation of 'worship purely' for 'kiss ye the son,' and 'a mighty One' for the 'mighty God' were but the renewal of old cavils often refuted. A prophet was one sent by God to communicate a divine revelation to men. There are many predictions in the Old Testament made long before the events took place; Nahum foretold the destruction of Nineveh a hundred years before Nineveh was destroyed, Hosea and Amos threatened their country with the scourge of Assyria, when as yet the victorious Jeroboam was King of Israel. Micah predicted the fall of Samaria long before Samaria fell. The same prophet foretold the captivity in Babylon, and the return of the Jews to Canaan, when the Chaldeans were but an insignificant people. Isaiah predicted that they would destroy Tyre and Sidon. When Christ interpreted

Old Testament prophecies we must receive His interpretation 'I have called my son out of Egypt' and 'Rachael weeping for her children' might be adaptations rather than prophecies, but Christ and His apostles interpreted many things from the old prophets as referring to the gospel.

The fourth Essay dealt with ideology and subscription. The writer was F. C. Cook, Prebendary of St Paul's. Ideology means that narratives which are not true literally, may yet be true ideally, so that while the narrative is rejected, the spiritual truth at its basis is accepted. Subscription was defended as necessary to preserve definiteness of doctrine. St Paul would not have authorised anyone to preach who denied the resurrection. He delivered Hymenæus and Alexander over to Satan.

The fifth Essay was on the 'Mosaic Record of Creation,' Dr M^cCaul was the writer. He defended the literal interpretation, and controverted the conclusions of modern critics of the Old Testament. The distinction between the 'Elohistic' and 'Jehovistic' is founded on the assumption that Elohim, and Jehovah mean the same. But in reality Elohim is God, and Jehovah is the name of God. The difference is like that between Deus and Jupiter. Genesis ii to 4, is not a summary of what is to follow, but of what has gone before. The second chapter does not give a cosmogony, nor even a geogeny. 'In the beginning' is the duration of time preceding creation. Something new was created out of nothing, or, it may have been, out of something already existing. The waters covering the earth agrees with the Neptunic origin of the globe as taught by geologists. Recent discoveries show that there may be light independently of the sun. The scientific accuracy of Moses is so remarkable as to lead to the inference that he must have been guided by a supernatural hand. To make the seven days of creation poetry as some have done, and not literal history, is not to defend the ark of God but to abandon it to the enemy.

Professor Rawlinson¹ who wrote the sixth Essay, which was on the Pentateuch, also found no discrepancy between science and the Mosaic record. When a book is handed down to us bearing a certain name, it should be taken as

¹ George Rawlinson Professor of Ancient History at Oxford.

genuine till the contrary is proved. The Pentateuch has internal evidence of Mosaic authorship. The style, the archaisms, the close acquaintance with Egypt, all point to the time of Moses. The chapter which mentions the kings of Edom¹ before there was any king over the children of Israel, may have been written prophetically, or inserted by a later hand. Bunsen distorts the lists of Manetho to make them fit his theory. By the help of some ingenious conjectures, it is shown that the seventy who went down into Egypt might have been two millions by the time of the Exodus.

Edward Harold Browne, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, afterwards Bishop of Ely and then of Winchester, wrote on 'Inspiration.' He held by the old distinction between supernatural illumination and the inspiration of good men. Fathers, Schoolmen and Reformers, all distinguish between what we may know of ourselves and what is revealed. Inspiration is of the nature of a miracle, and is questioned only by those who have doubts about miracles. Luther subjected the New Testament to the criticism of his own intuitions. It is the error of Pietists and Illuminists to compare the light of nature with the light of revelation. Coleridge and his disciple Maurice confused the inspiration of saints with that of Apostles.

'Scripture and its interpretation' by Dr Ellicott, Dean of Exeter, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, was intended for an answer to Jowett. 'The great reformation proposed by the 'Seven Champions' was spoken of ironically and categorised under the description of St Paul: 'Knowledge puffeth up.' Arranged in new combinations, and disguised in new trappings the old quibbles were mustered up again. Antichrist was coming, and the Seven Essayists were his prophets sent to prepare the way before him. That Scripture is capable of various interpretations and applications shows the manifold Wisdom of God. These are not more than the nature and importance of the subject matter would lead us to expect. The difference between the ancient and the modern interpretation of Scripture had been greatly exaggerated. The literal and the historical method had from the earliest

¹ Gen. xxxvi, 4.

ages been regarded as the true one, and many traditional interpretations would bear the test of Lirinensis—‘believed always everywhere and by all.’

The other volume called, ‘Replies to Essays and Reviews’ was edited by Bishop Wilberforce, The astute Bishop took the precaution to write his preface before he read the replies, but he described the object as not so much to refute error as to establish truth. The Bishop’s orthodoxy was not more prominent than his supreme contempt for the intellect, learning and moral purpose of the Essayists. The arguments were neither new nor powerful, and the questions discussed were of a kind which should not be raised among Christians. The Essays had been evoked in the way of reaction by the ‘renewed assertion of the importance of dogmatic truth, and primitive Christian practice.’ This eloquent circumlocution probably meant the Oxford movement. The Bishop also saw in the Essays the preparation for Antichrist. Their doctrine was grandiosely described as a ‘tricked out Pantheism.’

Edward Meyrick Goulburn criticised the Essay on the ‘Education of the Human Race.’ Our present condition, he said, is that of discipline of humility of mind. We must be brought to faith in God’s word and then acquiesce in all difficulties and obscurities. In the education of the mind of the Church there is no substantial accession of knowledge, only the development of what was originally in the rudiments. Progress in civilisation is not the same as progress in divine knowledge. The mental culture of Greece and Rome was different in kind from development in truth and holiness. Christ came in the fulness of time. That is admitted, but Dr Temple had said that if He had come later it would have been hard to believe His divinity, as the faculty of faith was turned inwards and could not accept an outward manifestation of the truth, which is interpreted to mean that ‘the world had now become too wise to accept miracles as the credentials of a message from God.’

Hugh James Rose answered Rowland Williams. He argued that the question of the truth of Bible histories, and chronologies affected the foundations of Christianity. It was no indifferent matter whether or not we are to believe the Mosaic account of the creation of man. Bunsen was rash and

self-confident, even beyond the example of his countrymen who are now giving up the Rationalism which is being imported into England. Even such scholars as Gesenius and Ewald have to be watched. Their statements about the Elohist and Jehovist passages are not to be trusted. Bishop Butler had been quoted as saying that prophecies may have had their fulfilment in contemporary history, but he expressly refutes what is thus ascribed to him. Bishop Chandler is said to have reckoned only twelve Messianic prophecies, and Paley ventured to quote just one, but Chandler's twelve are given as specimens, and Paley's one was the clearest and sufficient for his argument. Jerome's preference for 'worship purely' instead of 'kiss ye the son,' was made merely to avoid calumnies from the Jews. Isaiah liii had long been understood by the Jews as referring to the Messiah. They applied it to Jeremiah to escape its application to Jesus, but this is now abandoned.

Baden Powell's Essay on 'The Study of the Evidences' was answered by C. A. Heurtley, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford. He said that such was the credulity of unbelief that Darwin's self-evolving process of nature was made to over-ride the Mosaic account of creation. Miracles were moral forces which may keep the physical in check without violating the laws of nature. The miracles of Jesus rest on the testimony of eye witnesses and they are such as had been foretold would be wrought by the Messiah.

The Essay on the National Church was answered by Dr William Josiah Irons. The Church, he said, before the Reformation was really national. The Act of Toleration formally registered the fact that it was so no longer. The idea that the National Church was an organ of the national life, that speculative doctrines were to be left to philosophers, while the Church concerns itself with the ethical development of its members, alarmingly corresponds with the facts of our religious life as a nation; a Church without supernatural claims, depending on the Bible alone, but a Bible deprived of the supernatural. It is a generalised Christianity, very different from that of the Apostles, who put doctrine above morals. They said a man that is a heretic reject. Primitive Christianity was very exclusive. It said 'Strait is the Gate.'

The Essay on 'The Mosaic Cosmogony' was answered by Gilbert Rorison, an Episcopal minister in the north of Scotland. He made the record in Genesis 'an inspired psalm of creation.' The writer on that subject in 'Aids to Faith,' said that the man who did not take the record literally but made it poetry was a traitor, who gave up 'the sacred ark to the enemy.'

A. C. Haddon's Essay on Rationalism was intended as an answer to Pattison. It lauded the principles of the Oxford movement under Newman and Pusey, which was the proper remedy for the divinity of the eighteenth century. Toleration was a sceptical spirit based on indifference. Against this, individualising Methodism was a reaction. The Oxford men had protested in good time against the attempts to deal with religious truth, through the instrumentality of reason and the misuse of private judgment by Methodists and Evangelicals. We did not want new creeds. The Rationalists of the school of Tillotson paid too little attention to the authority of the Church, but they were not so far gone as to speak of a verifying faculty. The Hanoverian divines did not all tend to Rationalism. Butler's Analogy is an elaborate depreciation of the supremacy of reason.

The reply to Jowett was made by Christopher Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. He exposed the ignorance of the Greek Professor. It was like that of a benighted person, and it was not credible that it could be found in one holding a position in a University. Jowett had said that the Elzevir edition of the Greek Testament had been invested with authority as a *pièce de resistance*, against innovation. This was so far from being true that in the last half century, scarcely a Biblical scholar among those who had put forth annotated editions of the Greek Testament had made a stand for the Elzevir. That the Professor's mode of interpreting Scripture is vicious, has its evidence in the fact that he can find in the New Testament neither infant baptism nor Episcopal government. Our best divines have found them there. The Apostles' command is, 'Baptise all nations,' and infants are part of nations. Episcopal government has been in the Church from the

beginning, and the best interpreters of a law are those who lived when the law was given. As an instance of a prophecy that had failed, Jowett cited Jeremiah's predictions concerning Jehoiakim that he should have none to sit upon the throne of his father David, but his son Jehoiachin reigned in his stead. Wordsworth answered that he only reigned a quarter of a year, and so did not *sit* upon the throne, did not permanently reign. The prophecy therefore was not a failure.

The root of all the Greek Professor's errors is that he does not believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Inspiration means infallibility. If the documents are not free from error, we have no authority for the doctrines contained in them. Inspiration had never been defined by any ecclesiastical authority because it had always been settled. 'Out of Egypt have I called my son,' is an instance of a passage having more meanings than one. It proves the falsity of the principle that Scripture has only one meaning. When an inspired writer interprets, we are bound to receive his interpretation. It is presumption for a nineteenth century essayist to contradict an Evangelist's interpretation of a Hebrew prophecy. The learning of heretics is about as bad as their good works. But for the position of the writers, this book would never have emerged from obscurity. It fights against the Church clad in the Church's uniform, the Trojan horse bearing within the armour of the Greeks. The case of Bahrtdt, a German theologian, who led an immoral life, and died a miserable death, is a warning to all who, like the Regius Professor of Greek, depart from the old paths and disregard the authority and the creeds of the Church.

John William Burgon afterwards Dean of Chichester, refuted all the seven Essayists. He wrote from the standpoint of one who believed in the full infallible inspiration of every word and syllable in the Bible, and that the Church clergy alone had a commission to preach the gospel. He found clergymen writing against the creeds they had subscribed, the doctrines they were pledged to teach, and the infallibility of the Bible on which all rested. The first Essay contained the germ of all the rest, and was the feeblest of all. The

allegory was worthless, and had all the faults of a school-boy's theme. Instead of the faith once delivered to the Saints, we were to have the education of the human race. The other Essayists were infidels, who believed in neither God nor Bible. Burgon smote the 'seven champions,' some one facetiously said with the 'jaw-bone of an ass.'

Williams and Wilson were prosecuted and condemned in the Court of Arches on five of thirty-two charges. They appealed to the Privy Council. Two of the five charges were withdrawn by the prosecutors. There remained three on which the Privy Council had to pronounce judgment; inspiration, future punishment, imputed righteousness, or the transfer of merit. On the first it was found that the XXXIX Articles had not defined inspiration. On the second, that the original word translated 'everlasting' was ambiguous, and that there was nothing in the formularies which made it penal for a clergyman to express a hope that even the ultimate pardon of the wicked who are condemned in the day of Judgment, may be consistent with the will of God. On the third it was found that the Articles were wholly silent.

So the judgment of the Court of Arches was reversed. This declared the liberty which exists in the Church of England for free handling of the Bible, for a wide definition of inspiration, and for leaving open the question of never ending punishment.¹

The High Church and Evangelical parties had united to seek the condemnation of the Essayists. Each found the other to be 'a brother born for adversity.' Dr Pusey rushed into the arms of the *Record*, and Archdeacon Denison embraced Dr McCaul. Then, it was said, was fulfilled that which was spoken by the Evangelist 'from that day Herod and Pontius Pilate were friends.' Wickedly were the words of the Gibeonites to David put into their lips, 'Let seven men of his sons be delivered unto us and we will hang them up unto the Lord, in Gibeah of Saul.'

It was difficult to hang, after the law had pronounced an acquittal. Still much could be done. There was a scheme for endowing the Greek professorship which was held by

¹ Williams did not deny never-ending punishment, and Wilson was not charged with the denial of imputed merit.

Jowett. This was successfully opposed. A petition protesting against the judgment was got up by Dr Pusey, and the clergy were implored to sign it 'for the love of God.'¹ Convocation passed a synodical judgment on the book, and after saying all they could say, they did all they could do, which was nothing. The two Archbishops issued Pastorals to quiet the fears of the clergy and laity. Meanwhile Cardinal Wiseman in the hope of turning the balance in favour of his own Church, claimed that it had authoritatively decided on the question of inspiration and the never-ending duration of hell fire, which he called 'vital doctrines of the sacred deposit.' But he was unable to show that on these two subjects the Church of Rome had ever spoken with authority any more than the Church of England.²

¹It got the signatures of 11,000 chiefly of the lower orders of the clergy.

²See Stanley on The Three Pastorals.

CHAPTER XV

WRITERS OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS

THE writer of the first Essay is at present Bishop of London. His sermons preached at Rugby do not contain much theology, and still less anything that might be considered heresy. The ever-recurring idea is the supremacy of conscience. The voice within speaks with authority and calls upon us to believe its claim. It says 'that above and beyond and beneath all that exists or can exist is the unchangeable law of right and truth and goodness.'¹ To believe and to obey this voice is faith. The power which breathes through the Bible meets its answer in the heart of man. Those who believe not Moses or the prophets will not be convinced by a miracle. The difficulty of belief in spiritual truth is not outside, it is within. Though the Bible has this power, we are not to suppose that the Bible was dictated by God Himself. It is written in human language and the thoughts are human, but it has an indwelling 'divine authority unlike anything else which the world has ever seen.'² Our conception of the Bible may have to be modified, but this power to reach the conscience of man will ever remain. In 1884, Bishop Temple was Bampton Lecturer. His subject was the relation between religion and science. The special object was to show the bearing of the Darwinian doctrine of evolution on theology. Having virtually assumed that this doctrine was established, it was applied to the argument from design. Paley said that a watch proves a watchmaker. He doubtless

¹ First series, p. 82.

² Second series, p. 35.

supposed everything to come into existence as it now is, but supposing evolution, his argument is still good. We have only to think of design being worked out by a slow process instead of by a direct act of creation. Paley had in a way prepared for this application of his argument. He said that the evidence of design was not less if it were found that the watch produced another watch like itself. Certainly it is not lessened if, on the principle of evolution, it produces one better than itself. It had been objected to Paley's argument that it represents the Almighty as contending to overcome difficulties with intractable materials; but the idea of evolution removes this objection. It is more worthy of the majesty of God that He did not make the things, but caused them to make themselves. Evolution supplies an answer to the objection from the imperfections of the world. These are like the imperfections of a half-completed picture. Evolution, too, gives the idea of unity, and so one designer, not many, as might have been inferred from mere design. It corresponds also with the development of revelation, which is progressive. Evolution does not account for the introduction of life. Here is room for miracle. The record in Genesis was not to teach science but great spiritual and moral lessons. It takes the facts of nature as they appear to ordinary people. Miracles are explained as after all probably in harmony with the uniformity of nature, and in the strictest sense not miracles. To those who saw Christ's miracles they were evidence, but to us the main evidence of revelation consists in its harmony with the voice of the spiritual faculty within us.

Rowland Williams¹ had been in trouble some time before the publication of 'Essays and Reviews.' In 1855 he had published a volume of sermons under the title of 'Rational Godliness.' These sermons had been preached, some of them at Cambridge and others at Lampeter. They were severely criticised by the orthodox journals, while they inspired great hopes in those who were looking for liberal progress in theology. The best key to Dr Williams' position is in his doctrine concerning the Church. With no tendency to either Romanism or Tractarianism he might, in a sense, be called a High Churchman. The Church was the embodied repre-

¹ B. 1817, d. 1870.

sentative of Christianity, the elect assembly of God, the witness of Holy Writ, the dispenser of the Sacraments and the peculiar temple of the Holy Spirit. There was a time when the Bible was not. It is not, therefore, necessary to salvation. The Church was before the Bible, as a speaker is before his voice. The Bible is not so much the foundation of the Christian faith as it is its creature, its expression, its embodiment. The Bible embraces the experience of the Church of old. It is the record of her revelations and the tradition of her spiritual life, the transfusion of her spirit into writing.

The Bible then proceeds from the Church, and the Church is the creation of the Spirit. That same Spirit is in the Church now inspiring men as it inspired the saints of old. But inspiration is not infallibility. It made no supernatural communication of facts of history or science. The Bible contains a human element. The writers were men of like passions with ourselves. They had the same imperfections. The inspiration which they claimed they allowed to their hearers. The Bible is the Word of God by a metaphor and not in the sense that it was dictated by God Himself. The writers were taught through the medium of their hearts rather than of their heads.

Revelation needs no external evidence. It is an unveiling. The Scriptures spring from two sources, the Holy Spirit of God and the conscience of man. That life-giving power is still in the world. It is the best evidence of Christianity, in other words, Christianity is its own evidence. There is a sense of righteousness in man which is ever being trained upward to realise the unwritten Word of God. There is a voice born of those deep desires and intellectual requirements which make up our mental being, to which when such a picture as appears in Jesus Christ of the Eternal God and of His truth is presented, it exclaims, 'To whom Lord can we go but unto Thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life.' With this view of the Church and the Bible we expect to find different stages of development. The warlike Hebrew who worshipped the god of armies, and the Quaker who worships the Prince of Peace, were both taught of God. The Church has a power of bringing out of her treasury things new as well as old.

This may be seen more in detail by the treatment of prophecy. Williams says, 'The entire question of prophecy requires to be opened up from its very foundations.' When some of the sermons were preached, the preacher believed that there were prophecies which had but one sense, and that the directly Messianic; but notes were added to the effect that he was now convinced every prophecy had its elucidation in contemporaneous history. There is in fact no prophecy, that is, prediction, which has not a primary and literal interpretation, and if referred to the Messiah, is fulfilled in a secondary or allegorical sense. The woman's seed was to bruise the serpent's head. The seed is mankind and Jesus fulfils the prophecy as the representative of mankind triumphing over evil. The prophet of whom Moses spoke like unto himself is Jesus, as the greatest of the prophets, but the prophecy was also fulfilled in others. The psalms called Messianic have been messianised by rhetoric, and there has been a long consecration of error. The prophets spoke of a good time to come when Jehovah would have mercy on Israel and bring back the exiles from captivity. This has not been fulfilled literally and we look for the promise beyond the grave. The whole of the quotations from the Old Testament in the New cited as fulfilments are merely illustrations or adaptations. The Deliverer who was to be born in Bethlehem is one who was to consolidate the divided kingdom, certainly not any distant Messiah either earthly or heavenly. Adaptations of such prophecies are perfectly legitimate, but the natural and historical sense is not to be denied. The criticism which does justice to the historical sense is traced to Calvin and after him to Grotius.¹

Henry Bristow Wilson was one of the four tutors who wrote the Letter which led to the cessation of the 'Tracts for the Times.' He rapidly developed into a very liberal theologian. In 1851, as Bampton Lecturer, he lectured on one of the articles of the Apostles' creed, 'The Communion of Saints.' This clause was found only in one of the three creeds, and not even in all the original copies of the Apostles' creed. It was not recognised by Ruffinus or Augustine, nor was it generally received till about the beginning of the fifth century. To find its origin would be to find its meaning. Some supposed

¹ See the Hebrew Prophets, part I, p. 153-163.

it referred to the Donatists who claimed catholicity. Others explain it as arising from the Western ideas of municipality and citizenship. It was the 'City of God,' of which Augustine discoursed, as taking the place of the old Roman State then passing to dissolution. As a matter of fact the first exposition of it is found to be in the relation of the living saints to the departed. On this arose the doctrine of Purgatory, of the living helping the dead and delivering them from suffering by prayers and masses. Our Reformers though they retained the clause of the creed left its meaning practically vague. In Protestant theology the communion of saints is the relation of being common participants in the same spiritual blessings which constitute the bond of this communion.

The Lecturer now entered on the investigation of the principles which constitute the bond of this communion. The first considered was the objective or that of the Church of Rome, and the next the subjective or that of the Protestant Churches. The objective principle or the dogmatic is not found to supply a sufficient bond of union. It sought a *gnosis* on which all might be agreed, but the more this was defined the more certainly some men were excluded.

Christianity was intended for a universal or Catholic religion. This was its attitude over against Paganism, in which every nation had its own religion. When St Paul argued for Justification by faith it was on the ground that the partition wall between Jew and Gentile was removed. The same doctrine with Luther took another form. It brought in the individual element rather than the collective. Calvin too though not belonging to the Teutonic subjective races so far agreed with Luther, that he made the ultimate appeal and test of membership to be the individual consciousness. While the Roman Church placed the assurance of forgiveness in the external authority of the clergy, Luther placed it in the individual conscience, and Calvin in the assured conviction of the election of grace. The subjective ground as the bond of union was found to be more hopeless than the objective.

The next inquiry is into the principles of grace, whether those that are immediate or the sacramental. The first being subjective and individual, are open to the same objection

as the subjectivity of Luther and Calvin. On the subject of sacramental grace the Reformers were confused and inconsistent. Luther's doctrine was a *creophagia* as gross as that taught in the Romish Church. Calvin maintained a heterogeneity of cause and effect in the sacraments, a spiritual consequence from a material antecedent. The 'clear-headed and intrepid Zwingli' alone anticipated the precision and consistency of modern philosophy. His theory is intelligible and consistent. With him all spiritual and sacramental influence must operate according to laws. The bond of union must be sought in some moral principle. The Christian Church is a Catholic society capable of being propagated throughout the world and continuing to the end of time. The true bond of the communion of saints is in the imitation of Christ. The true 'channels of grace' are those which transmit moral influence. Those who are conformed to Christ are one in all times and in all Churches.

In 1861 Wilson wrote an Essay on Inspiration.¹ He counselled those who had availed themselves of the revelations of modern criticism not to allow the next generation to pass through the same process of struggle which they had done, but to abridge their labour. In the Bible is found spiritual continuity and growth such as we have in no other book, but we cannot suppose all spiritual life manifested in words to have ceased with the determination of the Canon. This would be like denying the indwelling of the Eternal Spirit in the world and especially in the Catholic Church. The writers of the Bible give their own colouring to their histories in the same way as has been done by ecclesiastical historians. It is supposed that the solution of the present difficulties concerning Inspiration, Prophecy, Miracles in general, may be found in the connection between the natural and the supernatural, which shade into each other and are separated by no determinate line. The distinction is relative to us, and is founded on human ignorance.

Baden Powell² as a Fellow of Oriel with Whately and

¹ See Introduction to a Brief Examination of the Prevalent Notions of the Inspiration of the Old and New Testaments (believed to be by Dr John Muir the Sanscrit scholar).

² B. 1796, d. 1860.

Arnold might be classed with the Noetics. His earliest efforts were in defence of orthodox theology against reason, or, at least, against reason as applied by Unitarians to explain the mysteries of the Gospel or to reject what was not within the compass of reason.¹ His favourite mottoes were such sentences from the Fathers as condemned heretics for their reliance on reason and being wise above what is written. He endorsed the arguments of Augustine on the utility of believing as opposed to those who promised that reason would make all things plain. The orthodox distinction of 'above reason' and 'against reason' was followed, and the orthodox principle was adopted of believing whatever could be found in the Scriptures in the plain and literal sense. This was reckoned a rational principle as distinguished from the 'empty pretension' of Unitarians who brought down the doctrines of Christianity to the standard of their own narrow conceptions. Christianity had been proved by miracles and prophecy to the satisfaction of reason, and therefore its doctrines were to be believed as they were revealed, and not to be explained away. Those who do the latter do not understand in what a rational belief consists. The doctrinal system of the Church of England is commended as not having been built on isolated texts and detached passages, but 'collected and accumulated, weighed and scrutinised by the diligence and judgment of the Fathers and luminaries of the Christian Church for a long succession of ages.'²

This position was very soon abandoned.³ He admitted absolute contradictions in the Scriptures, but maintained that these were no argument against the truth of revelation. The sacred writers convey their doctrines through the medium of history, fiction, and poetry as well as by direct precepts. Attempts to gloss over difficulties, to torture texts, to make them agree with facts or to dispute the authority on which the facts are stated, are a lamentable waste of time and ingenuity, and grounded on a misconception of the nature and design of revelation. These

¹ See *Rational Religion examined, or Remarks on the Pretensions of Unitarianism*, 1826.

² p. 38.

³ See *Revelation and Science* 1833, in answer to Nolan's Bampton Lectures.

attempts have been common since the first dawn of experimental philosophy ; from the days of Galileo when Foscarius published his ingenious reconciliation of the motion of the earth with Scripture by means of refined glosses and interpretations, and from the time when Tycho Brahe constructed a new system of the universe with the same object.

Though rejecting the harmonies made by orthodox theologians, Baden Powell ever professed to have at heart the interests both of science and theology. His favourite subjects were inductive philosophy, causation, final causes and such like on all of which he said there was great confusion which he tried to clear away¹. Induction reveals order, arrangement, uniformity, and throughout nature these evidence a supreme mind. But nature does not show a first, efficient or moral cause. It only shows phenomena and their sequences. Though this be all that is found in nature, that does not touch on the idea of a moral cause. Unity, order, system indicate mind. The connected series of physical causations is the manifestation of moral causation or the action of will.

The term 'final causes' has involved some confusion of ideas. The essential characteristic of organisation is intention. The advocates of final causes narrow and restrict the argument by confining the proofs of design to instances of adaptation of means to a perceptible end. But the instances of a use and a purpose constitute only a very small and subordinate portion of the vast system of universal order, harmony, and design, which pervades and connects the whole. We can trace symmetry and arrangement where we cannot see the end or adjustment. These are the results of mind, and it may be, they answer some end unknown to us. Paley held that the mechanism of the heavens showed least design, and so was of little service to this argument, but as manifesting symmetry, beauty, order, it is the highest and the most satisfactory. Some find God only in apparent interruptions or interferences. These are the footsteps of the Creator. He is excluded from the uniform order, and found only in the exceptions which it may be fairly assumed future discoveries will show to be parts of the universal order.

¹ See *The Spirit of Inductive Philosophy, The Unity of Worlds, The Philosophy of Creation.*

The distinction between physical and moral causes explains a passage in the 'Essays and Reviews' which evoked severe criticism. It was 'Creation is only the expression of our ignorance as to the mode of first production.' This means that no physical philosophy can give us any idea of the beginning of nature. It only gives secondary causes and from these we infer a first cause. Development means that God has so constituted the machine of the universe, that it carries on its work without interference. What is commonly meant by 'Creation' is an interruption, and of this physical science sees nothing anywhere in nature.

The errors of the two parties which represent the popular forms of religion in England are described as Judaical.¹ The one has created great excitement by the renewal of ecclesiastical ceremonies. The other is guilty of a much greater enormity. It enjoins the observance of a Sabbath day which is contrary to the freedom of the gospel, interferes with the pursuits and enjoyments of the working-classes, and is a yoke of bondage on all. Baden Powell was even angry with those Deists who had spoken of Sunday as the poor man's day, and having the obligation of its observance in natural religion. The other error was Bibliolatry, which had done more mischief to Christianity than had ever been done by Romanism. Systems had been made out of detached texts. The Modern Puritans even attempted to reconcile the discoveries of geology with the Mosaic cosmogony.

Mark Pattison left an Autobiography in which he has recorded many things which concern the religious movements in Oxford in his time, and his own connection with them. The Noetics are described as the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question, appealed to first principles and did not admit authority as a judge in intellectual matters. Against this arose Tractarianism as a counter-movement. It was the indispensable reactionary and complementary phase in the movement of thought which belongs to the nineteenth century.²

Pattison was the son of an Evangelical clergyman, and so his early training was under Evangelical influences. He had always been devout, and at Oxford readily fell in with the

¹ See 'Christianity without Judaism.'

² p. 81.

new movement. Newman employed him to write some of the lives of the saints in the series which he published. Like some other men of this party in their first zeal, he read daily the Roman Breviary. His 'High Church Fanaticism' was let loose without restraint, and he became 'a declared Puseyite, and then an ultra Puseyite.'¹ Dr Pusey was his confessor, and he is accused of revealing secrets told him in the confessional. His departure from the Pusey party was gradual, not due to any argument or controversy, but to 'a slow process of innutrition of the religious brain and development of the rational faculties.' He had passed from Puritanism to Anglicanism, and on to what was called Catholicism. Then came the recoil. 'I passed' he says, 'out of the Catholic phase but slowly, and in many years to this highest development where all religions appear in their historical light as efforts of the human spirit to come to an understanding with the Unseen Power whose presence it feels, but whose motives are a riddle. Thus Catholicism dropped off me as another husk which I had outgrown. There was no conversion or change of view. I could no more have helped what took place within me than I could have helped becoming one year older.'²

Benjamin Jowett³ was appointed Regius Professor of Greek in Oxford in 1855, and in 1870 was elected to the Mastership of Balliol. Before the time of 'Essays and Reviews' he had published 'The Epistles of St Paul, with Critical Notes and Dissertations.' One of the latter is on the coming of Christ. Almost every book in the New Testament speaks of this as at hand. In the discourses of Jesus as well as in the Epistles, we have such words as, 'This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled' and 'The end of all things is at hand.' They are of continual occurrence. The first Christians lived in the belief that 'the end is at hand,' and they acted on their belief. In our own day there still lingers a dim and meagre shadow of the same faith. No one can now be looking daily for Christ's coming. It would be much the same as if we expected an earthquake in a country where nature had been long at rest. Since the Fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were. Though Jesus spoke

¹ p. 184² p. 328³ B. 1817, d. 1889

of that generation not passing away, yet He said 'Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the Son.' We need not suppose that Jesus knew what He said He did not know. That the first Christians should have believed in the immediate coming of their Master was natural. It was the simple and child-like belief of men who expected the return of a lost friend and who never dreamed of a far-off futurity in this world. The gospel was to them an ending. The world's lifetime was in the past. They were in the latter days.

Men make difficulties in theology by trying to reconcile with obvious facts the opinions of a past age. St Paul is supposed to have spoken infallibly when he said that 'the Lord is at hand,' but he never lays claim to infallibility. Nor would such a claim be in harmony with the actual mode of revelation. It would involve endless difficulties such as that truths should not be expressed in human language or under the limitations of human faculties, and so it would have no relation to the thoughts of men. The New Testament is not to be interpreted apart from the course of events. Many lessons in divinity have to be learned by experience. In the course of ages the coming of Christ has been transferred from an outward to an *inward* coming.

Another dissertation is on the 'Man of Sin,' of which no reasonable interpretation can be found. Not any of the many persons to whom it has been applied will answer the description in the Scriptures. The prophets both in the Old and the New Testaments have a series of images of the evil which was to come upon the world in the latter days. Such were Gog and Magog in Ezekiel and the little horn in Daniel. The Apocalypse resembles Daniel, and both of them extend the purposes of God to the end of time. The spirit of prophecy may be said to be changing with the increasing purpose of God to man. The spirit changes while the imagery remains. But the spirit of prophecy is not in signs and wonders, it is in the divine sense of good and evil.

In a Dissertation on Natural Religion which is generally supposed to be different from revealed, it is said that the contrast is more in words than in ideas. It is hard to say where the one begins and the other ends. Experience is ever modifying the application of the truths of Scripture.

Revealed religion presupposes natural. Some identify natural religion with revealed, but not revealed with natural. They are willing to see all nature as a miracle, but not miracles as reducible to the course of nature. Yet the phenomena are the same read by a different light. We should lay aside the two modes of expression and think only of the 'purpose which through the ages runs.' The term, natural religion, may, however, be conveniently used to describe that point of view in which religion appears when separated from Judaism or Christianity.

The subject leads to an examination of the arguments for the being of God. The first is that from final causes. Here the work of creation is compared to a work of art. But the interval between the highest art and the lowest animal or vegetable is never to be spanned. The processes are unlike. We might reason that what the artist is, the God of nature is not. It is true we find design in nature, but nature often exhibits the absence of all design. The world is very good, but it is not the best of all possible worlds. Another defect of the final cause argument is that it sees God only in the animal frame and not in the dust to which it returns. Its knowledge of nature is fragmentary and superficial. Again it leads to an erroneous idea of the government of the world. It makes all things tend to some end. We cannot thus understand the use of barren deserts, venomous reptiles, or even the sins and miseries of mankind.

In considering a first cause, it is difficult to pass from this to the idea of a Creator. All we see in the world is effects and causes. The phenomenon is that of sequences. If we suppose the first link in the chain to be the same as the others, we have only natural sequence. God stands in some relation to the world, but we cannot determine whether He is immanent in the world or whether He transcends it. What underlies our conception both of first and final causes is the idea of law which we see not broken or interrupted, or appearing only in particular spots of nature, but everywhere and in all things. God made the world and even the absence of design is a part of the design, and the less comely parts have elements of use and beauty. The same action and uniformity which extend to all physical creation extend also

to the spiritual. Christianity is the confluence of many channels of human thought, but that does not interfere with its divine origin.

Another Dissertation is on 'Atonement and Satisfaction.' These are often explained in a way at which our feelings revolt. Some speak of Jesus bearing penalty and suffering infinite punishment. But the only sacrifice with which the Christian has to do is moral or spiritual, not pouring out of blood, but doing the will of God. The Levitical sacrifices are supposed to be typical of Christ's sacrifice, but the Mosaic religion was often independent of these, and the inward or spiritual truth often in defiance of them. In Isaiah God says 'Bring me no more vain oblations. Incense is an abomination unto me.' Again God says, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice.' Whatever St Paul may have meant when he spoke of sacrifice his revelation or inspiration was not greater than that of Jesus. The sermons and parables of Jesus do not speak of any sacrifice for sin, and they are not to be interpreted by the Epistles of St Paul. 'The disciple is not above his Master.' Jesus died for us in the same sense that He lived for us. He bore our sins as He bore our diseases. He died as a martyr to bear witness to the truth. The sacrificial and vicarious language are illustrative of the age when they were used. They are not the eternal symbols of the Christian, but shadows which come and go. They ought not to be fixed by definition or made the foundation of doctrinal systems. The Epistle to the Hebrews is strong about faith, but it never speaks about faith in the blood or sacrifice or death of Christ. The conclusion is that Christ would not sanction any of the theories of atonement or sacrifice with which we are familiar, yet it may be that all of them are consistent with a true service to Him.

CHAPTER XVI

BISHOP COLENZO

THE tempest raised by 'Essays and Reviews,' had scarcely subsided when a fresh storm arose over the publications of Bishop Colenso.¹ John William Colenso had been brought up under Evangelical influences. At the age of thirty a change came upon him through reading Maurice's 'Kingdom of Christ,' and some discourses by James Martineau. At first his progress in liberal ideas was not rapid. He thought he had got a long way when he could say that the baptised 'though in baptism formally taken into the Christian covenant,' were not 'then only first taken under the love of God in Christ.'² A few years later he was able to say that he no longer believed in never-ending punishment.

In 1853, a year before he was consecrated Bishop of Natal, Colenso dedicated a volume of Sermons to Professor Maurice. This raised suspicion of heresy, but it was scarcely visible except to those who had a keen capacity for diagnosis. The enemies of Maurice, who at this time were very many, were also the enemies of Colenso. The Evangelical judgment on the sermons was that they were 'deficient in the clear exhibition of definite Christian doctrine'³ which the biographer understands to mean that they 'show an instinctive reluctance to the use of party shibboleths.'

After Colenso's consecration the spirit of heresy developed with great rapidity. His metropolitan cited him to answer

¹ B. 1814, d. 1883.

² Cox, *Life of Colenso*, p. 41.

³ The Record.

charges of aberration from the Catholic faith. The heresies were found in a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, and in a criticism on the Pentateuch which he had begun to publish. They were on such subjects as justification which was defined as 'a consciousness of our being made righteous.' All men, even those who never heard of Christ, were said to have died unto sin and to have risen to righteousness. All had the second or spiritual birth at the time of their natural birth, and are, at all times, partakers of the body and blood of Christ. The Epistle to the Romans the Bishop maintained was addressed to all Romans heathen as well as Christian indiscriminately. The Bishop was also charged with denying endless punishment, and that Holy Scripture was the Word of God, or that it was inspired otherwise than as all good books are inspired. As he had asserted that Jesus was in error or ignorant as to the age and authorship of different portions of the Pentateuch, it was inferred that he had fallen into the Nestorian heresy of denying that the Godhead and the manhood were in one person.

Bishop Colenso had undertaken to translate the Scriptures into the Zulu language. He had for his assistant an intelligent native. As the translation proceeded, the Zulu asked the Bishop if it could be believed literally that Noah had in the ark all kinds of animals, and that he found food for them while they were in the ark. This question led the Bishop into inquiries about the origin and authenticity of the Pentateuch. The result was the publication of a series of volumes tending to show that it had other authors than Moses.

The first of these volumes was called 'The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.'¹ The preface spoke of inspiration and the doubts which many intelligent persons had about the common view which identified inspiration with infallibility. This was found first in the words of Archdeacon Pratt, that the 'writers of the Bible had the facts communicated to them, and that they were preserved from error of every kind.' Then it was found in the words of Dr Burgon that 'the Bible is no other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne; every word of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, yea, every letter of it is the direct utterance of

¹ 1861.

the Most High.' The Bishop thus states his own position. 'The result of my inquiry is that the Pentateuch, as a whole, could not possibly have been written by Moses or by any one acquainted personally with the facts which it professes to describe, and further, that the Mosaic narrative by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as I fully believe it does, revelations of the divine will and character, cannot be regarded as historically true.'¹ His difficulties were not merely with the miracles but with the palpable contradictions of the narrative. He added, 'It is perhaps God's will that we should be taught in this our own day among other precious lessons, not to build up our faith on a book though it be the Bible itself, but to realise more truly the blessedness of knowing that He Himself, the Living and True God, our Father and Friend, is nearer to us than any book can be.' The Bible though not in itself the Word of God yet contains that Word and all things necessary to salvation. We must take the Bible as it is and for what it is, and not attempt to put into it what we think ought to be there. We must not indulge the forward delusive faculty as Bishop Butler styles the imagination, and lay it down for certain beforehand that God could only reveal Himself to us by means of an 'infallible book.'

Colenso was a mathematician and well-skilled in arithmetic. This is shown in the character of many of his difficulties. Judah, for instance, was forty-two years of age at the going down into Egypt. According to the narrative, he must at that time have been a great-grandfather. Thus, he had three sons, one died and another married the widow, the second died and the third refused to marry the widow. The widow then deceived Judah and had two sons by him. One of these had two sons before the going down into Egypt. These would be the grand-children of the widow, and Judah was her father-in-law, and therefore in the rank of great-grandfather.

Another arithmetical calculation was the assembling of the whole congregation at the door of the tabernacle, which is supposed to have been within the court—a space which could not contain more than nine men. Again Moses and Aaron are said to have addressed all Israel, that is between two and

¹ p. 81.

three millions of people. The priests after the sacrifice were to carry the ashes without the camp, probably a distance of six miles. Two millions of people tabernacling in the wilderness would require two hundred thousand tents. Where did they get them, and how with their kneading troughs, and young children, did they manage to carry them? Six hundred thousand men armed, or nine times Wellington's army at Waterloo are said to have come out of Egypt. If the Egyptians allowed such armies it is marvellous that they did not rise for liberty long before. They kept the passover which required a lamb for each house, where did they get the necessary four thousand lambs? Where did they get pasture in the wilderness when the people had to be fed with manna from heaven? The conclusion is that the numbers are not only improbable but impossible. The sojourn in Egypt was not sufficient time for the increase from seventy persons to a number equal to the population of London.

In the second part it is found that there is evidence that the Pentateuch was the work of different authors. There is diversity in the records of the flood. In the one, two of every kind of beasts were to be taken into the ark, in the other seven. The Pentateuch is not called the five books of Moses in any Hebrew manuscript, in the Septuagint nor in the Vulgate. It is only found in the Fathers and they were ignorant of Hebrew.

Deuteronomy was probably written in the time of Isaiah, or it may have been the work of Jeremiah. Dean Milman had said that if the numbers in the Pentateuch were reduced the whole would be credible, consistent, and harmonious. To this Colenso answered that no reduction of numbers would make the story of the Pentateuch consistent or possible. The book of the law found in the Temple may have been Deuteronomy, but the whole Pentateuch could not have been written till after the captivity.

Of the many answers to Colenso, it is not necessary to notice more than one. That of Dr M^cCaul was the work of a good Hebrew scholar, and may be regarded as a full answer from the orthodox side.¹

¹ An Examination of Dr Colenso's Difficulties by Alexander M^cCaul, D.D., 2nd edition, 1863.

The writer was to examine Colenso's objections and difficulties, but his faith in the inspiration of the Mosaic writings did not rest on the successful solution of historical difficulties. He had the testimony of Jesus to the authenticity of these writings, and Jesus was omniscient. The difficulties are only such as might be expected in a book of so great antiquity as the Pentateuch. Some of them had been discerned centuries ago and had exercised the ingenuity of Christian Fathers and Jewish Rabbis.

Colenso assumed that Judah's grandchildren, Hezron and Hamul, were born in Canaan. The sacred writer certainly includes them among those who came down with Jacob into Egypt.¹ The number is in one verse threescore and six, and in the next verse threescore and ten; the larger number including the sons of Joseph, who were in Egypt, yet they are among those who came into Egypt. The other two may have been Hezron and Hamul, who though not yet born are mentioned as coming in the place of Er and Onan, two of Judah's sons who died in Canaan. In our translation the souls that came into Egypt are said to have been WITH Jacob. But the preposition *with* is not in the Hebrew text. The verse should be read 'All the souls of or belonging to Jacob who came into Egypt.' It says nothing of their accompanying Jacob, nor of the time when they went into Egypt, but in accordance with a mode of writing of which there are other examples, the writer in a general way speaks of all the descendants of Jacob including the sons of Joseph that they came into Egypt.

As to Judah's age, Colenso's calculation was that as Joseph was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh, after seven years of plenty and two of famine he would be thirty-nine, that is at the descent of Jacob and his family, and as Judah was three years older than Joseph he would be forty-two. But the Bishop had reckoned that Jacob was only twenty years in Mesopotamia, while he was probably much longer. There may have been an interval between the fourteen years he served for his two wives, and the six which he served for the cattle. It was not at the end of the fourteen years that he asked to be sent away, but after Rachel had borne Joseph. Now there was a long interval between the birth of Judah

¹ Gen. xlv, 26, 27.

and that of Dinah, and Joseph was born after Dinah. Judah was probably forty-nine years old when he came into Egypt.

The Bishop supposes that the writer of Leviticus when he speaks of Jehovah saying to Moses 'gather all the congregation together to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation' meant that the whole body of the people, at least six hundred thousand, were to stand in the court of the Tabernacle. But this supposition was very absurd. The writer could not have meant that so many thousands stood in such a small space. The obvious meaning is that they were assembled at, or as near to the door as such a multitude could come. The very preposition in Hebrew means 'towards' or 'tends to.' The difficulty about the two millions hearing the blessings and cursings read by Joshua is paralleled by Gibbon's account of the Council of Clermont. Many thousands were present, filling the streets and the fields. The Pope was on a lofty scaffold in the market place, and was said to address 'a well-prepared and impatient audience.' It may not have been possible in either case for every one to hear, but this does not render either record incredible or unhistorical. We have, moreover, the testimony of travellers who have made the experiment of speaking on Mount Ebal, and have been heard on Mount Gerizim, the two mountains between which lies the valley of Nablous, where the congregation were assembled, and as Joshua stood in the midst, it is possible he may have been heard even by the two millions.

The next difficulty is about the priest carrying the offal of the sacrifices six miles outside the camp. The Bishop says that he went on foot and carried it on his back—an addition which is due to the Bishop's imagination. Had he known or remembered the force of the Hebrew verb in *Hiphil* he would not even have said that he carried it. *Hiphil* is to cause to be done, as in English one is said to 'fell' a tree when he causes it to fall. Here the Bishop made an addition to the text. In another place he made an omission. When the congregation were taxed every one was to pay half a shekel of the shekel of the sanctuary. Now the sanctuary did not yet exist, and it could not therefore have been proper to speak of a shekel of the sanctuary, but the Bishop is reminded that

he had omitted the explanation which follows. 'A shekel is twenty gerahs.' The answer about the two hundred thousand tents is that the Bishop had overlooked the distinction between a tent and a booth. In Hebrew they are two different words. Some of the rich may have had tents, but the multitude would only have booths which were mere temporary things made of any material that could be found.

On the six hundred men 'armed' Dr McCaul has a good deal to say. The word in our translation is 'harnessed,' which doubtless, is equivalent to 'armed.' But the arming must have been very imperfect. When it is said the children of Israel went up armed, it need not mean that all were armed. They were certainly not 'warriors' as the Bishop calls them. The Hebrew word translated 'harnessed' is of very doubtful meaning. Some Hebrew scholars translate it 'fierce' or 'eager for battle,' and others 'marshalled in order.'

The difficulties about the Passover lambs were merely conjectures and were answered by conjectures. It was supposed that the people, as numerous as the inhabitants of London, and scattered all over the land of Goschen, were told on a notice of a few hours to keep the Passover. There was no time to get the lambs even if they could have been had to the number required. But it is answered that fifty, or even a hundred persons might have partaken of one lamb. Another consideration is that the peninsula of Sinai was not such a desert as it is now. It has probably very much changed. The Hauran, Lybian nome, and the Roman province of Africa are very different from what they once were. This also answers another objection that two millions of Israelites could not have lived in Palestine; but the Palestine of to-day is very different from the Palestine of the Jews. The most formidable of all the Bishop's difficulties seems, at first sight, to be how in four generations seventy persons could have increased to two millions. The Israelites, the Bishop says, had small families, but it is written that 'they increased abundantly and multiplied and waxed exceeding strong.' Moreover, the four generations may mean four hundred years, thus agreeing with the words in Exodus where it is said that the children of Israel were in Egypt four hundred and thirty years.

Colenso's avowed object was to destroy what he called the

idol of Bibliolatry. The letter of the Bible he compared to the law as understood by St Paul, which was to be put aside as a thing dead and of the past, while the spirit lives and could never die.¹ The accuracy of the *Peutateuch* may go, but the Sermon on the Mount abideth ever. We are not to shut our eyes to the light which God gives us. We should not be wiser than God. If the light of modern science comes from Him as we ought to believe it does, it must be a sin to disregard it. To take the Bible as what it is, a book not infallible, is not to destroy it. It will continue to do its work. The true and faithful of all lands, will, as in times past, still find unspeakable delight and consolation in the study of it. They will drink of the brook by the way. The witness of the great human family in its best and holiest moments to the value of the Bible is a surer evidence of its divine origin, than any decrees of synods or councils, or even than any miraculous proof. The present commotion about the Bible is like the cry of children in terror, when suddenly waked up from a pleasant dream, before they have realised the actual condition in which they are. It is a momentary fear. The Bible will hold its ground. The more it is studied the more divine it will appear, the more full of support and comfort for the soul of man.²

Colenso said little that was either new or original. The offence given to the orthodox world was intensified by the consideration that so much criticism in the way of finding inaccuracies in the Bible was not the primary work of a missionary Bishop.³

¹ See Sermon on the 'The Letter and the Spirit.'

² Sermons, p. 36.

³ A friend has reminded the author that Colenso was indefatigable in his proper duties, that he was excommunicated and deprived without law, and that his arguments are now taken up by such men as Canon Gore, and held without molestation.

CHAPTER XVII

UNITARIANISM IN ITS LATER DEVELOPMENT

THE most eminent living Unitarian has marked three stages of Unitarian thinking.¹ In a sermon on the text 'Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us,' the preacher echoed the lonely wail of the despised and isolated sect. They have been denied the name of Christians, but they claim their heritage as allowed of God though not of men. In the education of the race, to use the words of this sermon, the children have outgrown the father's home and emigrated to new lands of thought. In the original Unitarian theology there was an admitted defect. In making Christ wholly human there was no Mediator between the human and the divine. This defect the more recent growth has repaired. The one positive doctrine in Unitarian theology was the unipersonality of God in opposition to the Trinitarian doctrine, which made God three persons in the common meaning of the word person as an individual distinct from others. The Trinity had its root in the haze of ancient Pantheism, and this was to be swept away by the doctrine of the personal unity. The first stage of Unitarianism was the theology of Priestley. He made God one person, but in a way that He was left to be the only person in the universe. He was the Cause of all causes, the only Cause, all else was necessity. Man had no free will, and was in reality only a *thing*. On such a scheme communion between God and man was impossible. The reaction came with Channing.

¹ Sermon by James Martineau, 1869.

He taught the religion of conscience, the freedom of the will, its power to incur guilt, and to choose ruin. Man was not as in Priestley's theology, a merely moulded creature, but made in the image of God. The third stage is called the religion of the spirit. It recognises the possibility of communion between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. It teaches that 'the life with God of which saintly men in every age have testified is no illusion of enthusiasm.' In this last development of Unitarianism thus expounded, we see the spirit of the age and its contrast with that of the eighteenth century. All churches now speak of conversion and converted men, and have come to the belief of Apostles, Saints, and Methodists, that there really is a Holy Ghost.

The old paths of Priestley and Belsham were trodden by the majority of Unitarian writers up till recent times. In vindicating for Unitarians the right to be called Christians, Dr Joseph Hutton¹ quoted from Belsham that Unitarians believe all that St Paul requires of Christians, that is the resurrection of Christ and His miracles. Dr Beard defended Christianity as a revelation that could be proved by external evidences, and on that principle wrote answers to Strauss and Renan.

Charles Beard the son of this Dr Beard, and a member of the new school has delineated the old and new, and set forth the points of difference.² The old Unitarians appealed to the Scriptures in the same way as the Trinitarians, and they inquired into the early history of Christianity that they might trace the later corruptions. These efforts are instanced in the improved version of the Bible, and in the historical researches of Dr Priestley. The defects of the old Unitarians were on deeper and more practical questions—the relation between God, Christ, and man in the work of salvation. Their utterances on these subjects are described as uncertain and superficial. Their doctrines though professing to rest on Scripture were not laid on a firm foundation of philosophic thought. This refers to the influence of Priestley, whose materialistic philosophy and utilitarian morality were evolved out of Locke and Hartley, and which so deeply tinged

¹ Unitarians entitled to be called Christians, 1831.

² Old school and New.

Unitarian theology. The defection of Coleridge from the Unitarians was more a rebellion against Unitarian philosophy than against Unitarian theology. In the new school the theology or doctrines are the same, but the method of proof or evidence is different. The old school laid stress on the external, the new on the internal. It finds a revelation of God in the human mind, in creation, and in the Scriptures. Its merits are that it has 'deepened the consciousness of sin and enlarged the meaning of retribution, and that it has unveiled to rational Christians the mysteries of Pauline Theology.' Elsewhere this writer says that the Unitarianism of the present day 'does not accept its religion on the authority of the Bible, though it finds it there, and accepts it because it believes it to be consonant with sound reason and true conscience.'¹ The old Unitarian was 'too exclusively intellectual, logical, controversial, but the modern or at least the new school has learned that religion is not like mathematics, an affair of the intellect alone, but that with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and that the soul will not be reasoned out of her instincts.'²

For the position of the new school we must turn to the writings of John James Tayler and Dr Martineau. We begin with the former. Charged by a minister of the old school with not accepting the supernatural origin of Christianity, he answered that he ascribed 'all true religion to the inspiration of God as an original source.'³ When we read this we must be prepared for wider meanings to old words as well as wider ideas of the same subject. The charge was made on the understanding that Christianity was a supernatural revelation in a sense different from all heathen religions, which were regarded as the offspring of nature. The answer is, that the writer's faith in divine revelation is not less, but greater, than that of many other Christians. It extends the idea of supernatural revelation to the heathen who had in them particles of divine life, which preserved from moral rottenness the crude dark recesses of heathen superstition. These came from the fountain of light, from 'the constant, ever active presence of

¹ The Church and the Bible, 1873.

² Preaching the Gospel, 1873.

³ Pref. Two Lectures on Early Christianity, 1859.

God's Spirit, which underlies every genuine and earnest manifestation of our religious nature.' Here the regions which in the last century were regarded as the special domains of enthusiasm are the spheres of the operation of the divine Spirit. In all religions there is a spark of this ethereal fire which animates all spiritual natures, though nowhere does it rise to the same level as in Christianity. The capacity for religion, or the inward religious sense is developed in different individuals in various degrees of perfection corresponding to the development of the outward senses. Religion is an original element in the human mind which is in immediate contiguity with the divine Spirit, and is developed in accordance with the general laws of Providence. The Jewish religion, for instance, is evolved out of the earliest religion. This evolution is the work of the Spirit of God, but it all happens in what is called the order of nature.

The religious element innate in man is identified with the supernatural. It is itself supernatural.¹ The miraculous is not denied, but miracle is explained in a sense that to those accustomed to the old meanings of the word it seems no miracle. To understand this we may follow the writer in what he says of Christ's resurrection. The external evidence as recorded in the Evangelists is not reckoned sufficient, just when we expected it to be overwhelmingly strong it is 'fragmentary and disjointed.' Nevertheless there was a resurrection of Christ. That He passed from the earthly to the heavenly life was no delusion. Such a holy and benevolent revolution as that effected by Christianity could not rest on a falsehood. If the foundation was not a natural fact, it must have been a universal and spiritual fact. A Unitarian of the old school thus expressed his faith, 'Whatever I find distinctly expressed in any part of the Scriptures, I am prepared to receive as the Word of God.' On this Tayler said that the difficulties begin with the discrepancies between the Old and New Testaments, and between the different writers of each of them. Then comes the difficulty of translating the same truths into modern language. There must be a distinction between dogmatic form and a principle. We must, like Christ, go direct to the Fountain of light and life. By communion

¹ Christianity, what is it? 1863.

with the divine 'the eyes of the *heart* are opened.' Orthodox religious phrases, notably in hymns; may be used because of the spirit of devotion which is in them; the principle, so to speak, being the essence, while the dogmatic language is but the form.

The position of this class of Unitarians may be further seen from the writer's views of the constitution of the Church.¹ Christianity is neither a dogma nor an institution, but a life, a spiritual influence. This spiritual affection of the soul is the one thing that is constant amid the everchanging phenomena of Christianity. The dogmatic conception of Christianity gave rise to external evidences which are not satisfactory. A revelation should rest on proofs which the popular consciousness, once seriously awakened, can discern and approve. This does not mean that there is to be no theology, no dogmatic forms. These are a necessity for every mind which is in earnest about religion, but though necessary they should not take a permanent form. Of late years the National Church has shown more of this wide Catholicity than any of the sects. In this it answers to the Church of the Apostolic age which embraced many intellectual divergences. The essential element of union is faith in a person and not belief in propositions. The incarnation is a dogma, not among the fundamentals of the Christian faith, but open for discussion among speculative men.

Dr Martineau may be said to have always belonged to the new school; in the judgment of some he was its founder. It may be called the adaptation of Unitarianism to the spirit of the age. In his farewell sermon to his Liverpool congregation he admitted a change of tone in the community since he began his ministry. There had been a growing spirit of greater sympathy with the Christendom of the past and the present. The spirit, if not the form of orthodox theology, had come home to them in the light of reason and experience. The interval between God and humanity was bridged over. Man was capable of a union with the living God. The reconciliation of the divine and human is seen in Christ.

¹ A Catholic Christian Church, the Want of our Times, 1867.

In one of his earliest books,¹ Dr Martineau, after contrasting the Papal and the Protestant claims to infallibility, the one for the Church, the other for the Bible, gives an account of Rationalism in which we may read substantially his own position. It is a vindication of reason as that without which no conviction is possible. No external authority, no seeming inspiration, can establish anything contrary to reason. In all researches into religious truths the last appeal must be to the judgments of the human mind. The authority of the Scriptures depends on these judgments. It had often been alleged that after we are convinced there is a revelation in the Scriptures our only business is that of interpretation. This position is unsound, because by no amount of external evidence can a revelation be ascertained. It can never be more than a probability, and so can never be above the action of new evidence. Rationalism is commonly understood to embrace anti-supernaturalism, but the latter is an 'accidental accretion.' There may be miracles in connection with revelation. The reason for them is found in the infirmity of our nature, which connects with a divine origin all unusual and startling phenomena, while it is not so attentive as to see that the order of nature has really more of God than any miracle. Revelation, then, is no contradiction to natural religion. That would destroy its evidence. It is not a mere record of the principles of natural religion, for then it would be useless. It is an assumption of some, and an anticipation or confirmation of others.

The doctrine here taught that Scripture cannot over-ride reason excludes the doctrine of vicarious atonement as it has been commonly understood. The argument from analogy for vicarious suffering in nature is not admitted because it is drawn from what is dark and difficult in nature, and not from the light in which we recognise nature as the work of God. On this ground exception is taken to the argument of Bishop Butler which professes to obviate objections to Christianity, but which in reality raises difficulties in the way of believing God the author of nature. The Analogy contains 'the most terrible persuasive to Atheism that has ever been produced.' The essential error consists in selecting the diffi-

¹ *Rationale of Religious Inquiry*, 1845.

culties, which are the rare exceptional phenomena of nature, as the basis of analogy and argument.¹ This is said with an expression of deep reverence for Butler, as a reasoner and a writer on morals and perhaps with a forgetfulness that he was not offering proofs, but obviating objections, and that his argument was addressed to Deists who believed in God and in His goodness.

Dr Martineau's position in the new school led him to disregard the mere dogmas of the old Unitarians. He wished all congregations to be creedless, to leave those who came after them at liberty to form their own intellectual conceptions of Christianity. What was really permanent and what ought to be the mark of the Church was the spirit of Christ. In replying to Unitarian objections he said that a theological combination should not be identified with a Church combination. To alter dogma should not be to alter the Church. If this principle were admitted, Unitarians could have no claim to the property of the old Puritans.² He added these rather remarkable words, 'I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians, all seem to me to contrast unfavourably with their opponents and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy on the whole of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations as a learner from others in almost every department are to writers not of my own creed. The relative importance of the Unitarian controversy had declined during the previous half century. Unitarians had got better insight into the origin and meaning of the Trinitarian scheme. They had a more philosophical appreciation of its leading terms, such as substance and person. They made a more sympathetic approach to the mind of believers in the Trinity. This had disinclined them to make either its acceptance or its rejection a condition of Church communion.' This approach to the spirit of orthodox Christendom and depreciation of the importance of Unitarian dogmas ruffled the temper of the adherents of the old school. They refused to be held respon-

¹ *Studies of Christianity*, p. 93

² Letter to Rev. S. W. McDonald.

sible for sentiments which showed a want of sympathy with the fathers who had battled for Unitarian dogmas as for vital truth. Neither the worship nor the philosophy of Christianity could be identified with those of Trinitarians.¹

The Unitarian position is stated categorically in 'Loss and gain in Recent Theology.'² External authority in matters of religion has disappeared. The yoke of the Bible has followed the yoke of the Church; 'The Bible and the Bible only' with 'Scripture the only rule of faith' have lost their magic power. Religion is not the truth of any stereotyped propositions, but the highest life of the moving Spirit. It is called a noble but a severe advantage that we are driven from words to realities and must seek to get home to the universal springs of religion in our nature and experience. The entire Messianic mythology has disappeared from our faith. Not only the last argument from prophecy but the central Jewish dream of One to come is gone. Everything official has fallen away. Royal lineage, king, priest, and judge and coming with clouds. Jesus is simply the Divine flower of humanity.

The substance of Dr Martineau's teaching is summed up in his last important book.³ Religion is an internal assurance. There is something in man which he does not share with the other animals, something which belongs to him as a higher being and by which he interprets nature. By this he recognises the divine causality, a recognition which is primary and natural to man. Some suppose that evolution dispenses with causation, but growth must have a cause. It is the same thing whether causation has its effect at once or is sown sparse, as the invisible gold dust along the mountain range of ages.⁴ We see God in nature. Our minds carry us behind the phenomena. Hume made causation merely sequence, but we are precluded from conceiving phenomena at all except as dealt out by a power, and a power means a will. We find God in humanity. There is a conscience in man. 'All men born into the universe are ushered into a presence of a root of righteousness as surely as into the sense of actual

¹ Statement by Rev. R. Brook Aspland.

² An Address to former Students, 1881.

³ The Seat of Authority in Religion, 1890. ⁴ p. 14.

space.'¹ Conscience is the revealing and appealing book of God. We see God in history. The Hebrews were witnesses of a moral government. They followed the divine footsteps down the track of historical time, and made the course of history a highway for God. Revelation is only possible through the presence of God in the conscience of mankind. If our humanity were not itself an Emmanuel, there would be no Christ in us.² What is properly Revelation is God's work in nature and humanity, and it is carried on in a way that is natural and human.

¹ p. 69.

² p. 308.

CHAPTER XVIII

BENTHAM, CHARLES AND SARA HENNELL, W. R. GREG, F. W. NEWMAN, MILL, CARLYLE, J. A. FROUDE, MATTHEW ARNOLD, 'ECCE HOMO,' 'SUPERNATURAL RELIGION,' F. P. COBBE.

WRITERS who in the last century were called Deists are now called Theists. The one name is Latin, the other Greek. The reason of the change of name may be difficult to explain. Perhaps it is that Deist being appropriated by certain writers in the last century, the use of the same name might imply a closer identity than really exists. It is also possible that Deism by use though not in its original meaning may carry with it a negative idea from which the newer word Theism is free, and expresses more what is believed than what is not believed. But this again must be qualified as there are varieties both of negative and of positive belief.¹

The first name in the order of chronology of those who might come under the designation of Deists or Theists is Jeremy Bentham. Theology was not a subject much in his way, but he wrote occasionally against the received forms and doctrines of Christianity, generally falling back on the moral teaching while rejecting the doctrinal, or what some call the speculative.

'Not Paul but Jesus,' was written in 1825.² St Paul has had great admirers, but there are some who see no beauty in him. Lord Bolingbroke called his epistles 'metaphysical

¹ The word Theist is not in Johnson, but it is not quite a new word. It is in Sir Robert Boyle's Will.

² Under the name of Gamaliel Smith.

jargon.' Bentham held a brief against him, but how much Jesus was to gain by the sacrifice of the Apostle is not apparent.¹ As Conyers Middleton had exploded the authority of the Fathers, so Bentham aimed at the annihilation of that of St Paul. He not only found inconsistencies in his conduct, and discrepancies in his statements, but he found that his religion was no part of the religion of Jesus. His words have been the cause of all the dissensions among Christians. Jesus did all the good, and St Paul all the evil that is in the Christian Church. His doctrine has no warrant from the four Gospels, nor from anything Jesus said or did. He had no such commission as that to which he laid claim, and the sole motive of all his actions was personal ambition.

This is the impeachment. The evidence is manifold. There are five accounts of St Paul's conversion, every one of which, in some respects, differs from the others. The regularly appointed apostles never believed in his inward conversion. He took a false oath, and he predicted the end of the world before the death of persons then living. The temporal inducements to join the Christians were very great, sufficient to attract persons who had no belief in the religion of Jesus, nor in any other religion. Paul knew all about these temporal affairs which must have been good, when Simon Magnus wished to buy a share in the community. Paul aimed at the Presidential chair, not satisfied to have the whole Gentile world to himself he wanted also to be chief at Jerusalem. He professed not to break the law of Moses, yet his epistles show that he not only broke it himself, but taught others to do the same. His vaunted labours and perils were nothing compared with those of an ordinary soldier or sailor, and as for the wild beasts of Ephesus, they may only have been the dogs which had to be encountered by every wanderer who visited a great city.

In 1838 Charles Hennell wrote 'An Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity.' He supposed it to be a new or developed form of the sect of the Essenes. He repeated the familiar objections to the gospel histories. St Matthew perverted facts in making them fit Old Testament words. The

¹ Archbishop Whately said that the writer evidently cared as little for Jesus as he did for Paul.

prophecies ascribed to Jesus were up to the year 68 mere history, and what follows about the end of the world has never been fulfilled. According to some of the Evangelists Jesus rode into Jerusalem on an ass, but St Matthew makes Him to have ridden on an ass and a colt to fulfil what was said by Zachariah. St Matthew says that what was given to Jesus to drink was 'vinegar mingled with gall.' St Mark says it was 'wine mingled with myrrh.' St Matthew says that the priests bought the potters' field with the thirty pieces of silver. In the Acts of the Apostles it is Judas who bought the field. There is internal evidence that the first gospel was not written by an eye-witness. It was not therefore the work of St Matthew. The second gospel is the same as the first, with omissions and amplifications. The writer of the third gospel had other sources of information besides the first two gospels, but he writes without order. The 'Acts of the Apostles' is, on the other hand, an orderly composition. The speakers have suitable speeches ascribed to them after the manner found in Josephus and Herodotus. It is always clear as to time and place. St John's gospel is altogether unlike the others, and differs from them in the record of many events. The discourses ascribed to Jesus are like those in St John's epistles. If this gospel was written by St John, it must have been when he was about a hundred years old, and his vivid imagination unintentionally mingled truth and falsehood. Jesus, though an enthusiast and a revolutionist, was a great reformer. So far we have merely the negative side of the 'Inquiry.' The writer did not believe the miracles recorded by the Evangelists, but he was a believer in Christianity. He did not, however, rest its evidence on events which happened two thousand years ago, but on the thoughts and feelings of the human mind.

Sara Hennell in 'Thoughts in Aid of Faith,'¹ took up the subject on the positive side. Consolation was found in the new form of faith because it contained the substance of the old Revelation and is a natural continuous development of what is in man. History is a sure and certain revelation of the divine will. The cause of the supremacy of the man Jesus lay in a long course of events, which had swelled to a

¹Published in 1860.

crisis at the time of His appearance. His work was not His own but that of the Divine Hand which guided the ages. To give up the external form of Christianity is not to give up revelation. What the heart of man needs is found in Christianity. 'It is not,' as Bishop Butler said to the Deists, 'so clear a case that there is nothing in it.' There is the internal substance, that which comes from *within* and exists independently of that which comes from *without*.

Stories of creation and theories of inspiration are put aside. Christianity is the true religion because in it feeling is predominant, and feeling is as real a thing as logic. The outer vesture of Christianity may be cast aside, but the inheritance remains. The substance is felt to be real. It has nourished the souls of us all. In the same year the author published an Essay on 'The End of the World.' Here it was shown that the prophecies of Christ and His apostles were never fulfilled, which is a proof that Christianity, in its ordinary sense, was not a divine revelation. But it is a revelation in a higher sense. In the course of its history the nobler element has become more and more predominant. The whole history, including that of Judaism, ought to confirm us in a confidence in the divine order of the world.

The subject was resumed in 'Present Religion.'¹ God had been regarded as a Being apart from man and only acting upon him externally, but now that supernaturalism is abandoned, a new religious perception is awakened. God does not act in one manner, and man in another, but God is the universal spring of all actions. In the workmanship of man's religion there is no direct divine agency, but it proceeds from Him indirectly in the same way as every other work is natural. Religious progress is the proof of beneficent and superhuman control. Orthodoxy was the right thing for one period in human history, but that period has passed away. Growth implies perfecting by destruction. Our tearing ourselves away from ordinary beliefs is but the outer loosening of the soil. As the body changes yet preserves its identity so does religion. Christianity is, under the divine direction, the natural growth of the human mind. It is not, as the

¹ 1865.

Positivists say, a casual circumstance of growth, but it is itself the proper growth of the mind.

William Rathbone Greg wrote 'The Creed of Christendom,' which was also an effort to get at the substance of Christianity while casting off what were believed to be accretions. These had begun almost as soon as Jesus ended His ministry. Strauss, in answering the question 'Are we still Christians?' had defined Christianity as the Apostles' Creed, and said the Christian life was not feasible. Greg defended Christianity as the religion of Jesus, and said it was practicable. The mind and the temper of Jesus are for all time. His teaching was simple and informal, quite different from dogmatic formularies and ceremonial worship. Some of the conclusions are that the Scripture is not inspired in the sense of infallibility, that the gospels are not faithful records of the sayings and doings of Jesus, and that occasionally they ascribe to Him words which He never uttered and deeds which He never did. They were not written by eye-witnesses. The idea of revelation is not that of a supernatural communication. A truth not discoverable by the intellect cannot be otherwise revealed. The human mind cannot receive what it cannot originate. Truth is discovered by great minds who flash it forth before the eyes of men as it can be borne. Jesus Christ was an embodied revelation, humanity in its divinest phase, God manifest in the flesh, according to Eastern hyperbole. His religion is not the absolute perfect truth, but it contains more and purer and stronger truth than has yet been given to man.

The religious development of Francis William Newman, though in another direction than that of his brother the Cardinal, is of equal interest as a psychological study. Though at Oxford during the Tractarian movement, he does not seem to have been influenced by it either in the way of attraction or repulsion. Educated among the Evangelicals, his first theology was that of Calvin. At an early age he experienced a sensible conversion.¹ When at Oxford he was rebuked by his brother for showing so little reverence towards bishops. He answered that he did not reverence men who reached their stations mainly through political considerations.

¹ See *Phases of Faith or Passages from the History of my Life*, 1850.

For the old Fathers of the Church, he had as little reverence as for bishops, and when he came to the New Testament he preferred Paul to Jesus, and the Epistles to the Gospels. Then followed doubts about the Trinity and the sufficiency of the evidences of Christianity.

The Calvinistic theology entirely disappeared. Discrepancies in the New Testament proved that the Bible was not infallible. In Acts vii, 16, Abraham is said to have bought land from the children of Emmor, which is a confused version of Abraham purchasing from the children of Heth. In Acts v, 36, 37, Gamaliel is made to say that Theudas was earlier than Judas of Galilee, and Jesus is made to speak of the murder of Zacharias, the son of Barachias who was not slain till forty years after Jesus was crucified. Moreover the character of Jesus was found to be imperfect. Being merely human, He could not be faultless, He assumed the tone of a dogmatist and preached Himself.¹

For the further history of Newman's evolution we turn to another book, 'The Soul, its Sorrows, and its Aspirations, an Essay towards the Natural History of the Soul, as the True Basis of Theology.'² This was intended to be an Essay on the 'positive foundations of practical religion' or on 'the directness of knowledge of things spiritual.' As the moral sense discerns moral truth so the soul has a faculty of discerning spiritual truth. The spiritual man or man of faith is not one who believes at second hand. A mere historic faith is dead. This faculty of the soul not only sees the historical errors of the Bible, but those

¹ A comparison was supposed to have been made by Newman between Jesus Christ and Fletcher of Madeley, to the disparagement of the former. Henry Rogers in the 'Eclipse of Faith,' has these words: 'Do you remember that Newman says that when he was a boy he read Benson's Life of Fletcher, and thought Fletcher a better man than Jesus Christ.' Newman denied this, what he said was, 'I remember when a boy to have read the Life of Fletcher of Madeley, written by Benson, and he appeared to me an absolutely perfect man, and at this day if I were to read the book afresh I should think the character more perfect than that of Jesus.' The explanation is that the comparison was not between Fletcher and Jesus, but between the portraits drawn of the two by devoted admirers. It was added that the passage would have been better omitted.

which are moral and spiritual. In the soul's history, there is first the stage of awe, wonder, and admiration. To this, succeeds the conception of world order. The universe is a Kosmos, as the Greeks called it. Polytheism vanishes before the sense of design and goodness in the world. Goodness, indeed, is not so manifest as design, but if we are to think of God as an intelligent Being, we must think of Him as more perfect than man. Evil is only finite and transient, accidental to the transition towards a permanent good. This faculty of direct knowledge of the divine and spiritual gives greater certainty than any book can give. No external revelation can reveal any higher morality or any different conception of the character of God than the soul of man already possesses.

Newman's theology is called the theology of consciousness. It is evolved from the soul's inward experience. The sense of sin comes as sorrow. We know that the God of nature is the God of conscience. Hence emerges the idea of holiness as the opposite of sin. Sin is not merely crime or an offence against man but against God. The soul's peace does not come through believing any intellectual proposition such as the Atonement. It comes through 'an unreserved exposure of the heart to the eye of God.'¹ The desire for a Mediator is a human failing. It comes from the dread of too close a contact with the Divine, but this 'noxious doctrine' of mediation is neutralised by those who deify Christ. Conversion may be sudden. Religion being altogether an inward thing of the soul, enthusiasm is commendable. For the efficacy of prayer, we have the unanimous testimony of spiritual persons. That men have thirsted for God and rejoiced in the knowledge of Him is one of the facts of human nature. St Paul sets forth the struggle which the better part of man has with that which is imperfect, the spirit with the flesh. When the spirit has the complete victory, we reach perfection or full redemption. The new-born child of God has a sound conscience and a sincere mind, but no strong development of the soul.² When the soul has reached this stage, the hope of immortality becomes certain. This doctrine can never be established by such arguments as Plato's which may prove truths of science but not of religion.

¹ p. 457.² p. 125.

The soul in union with God does not believe that the union will ever terminate. To the mere logician this is foolishness, but those like Paul, who know that they are children of God and therefore heirs, know that as Jesus lives they shall live also. Eternal life has begun now. It is not fanaticism to believe in communion with the Father and the Son. This is better than the fetishism of a blessed wafer or of water sprinkled by a priest, better than the 'sacerdotal vanities' of 'episcopal powers,' 'baptismal regeneration,' or a mechanical apostolic succession.

In some of his later books,¹ Newman has retracted what he wrote about the immortality of the soul. He was satisfied that the child of God could have no doubt about the future, and he had advanced arguments for the probability of a future life. Now he confesses that 'other experiences had gradually swung him in the other direction.'

John Stuart Mill in his 'Autobiography' tells us he was brought up from the first without any religious belief. He added, 'I am one of the very few examples in this country of those who have not thrown off religious belief, but never had it, I grew up in a negative state with regard to it.' His father's creed was that some evil being made the world. The son was left to grope for the light by means of dry and hard logic. Religion had more attraction for him than for his father, and whatever may have been the precise relation to the kingdom of God which he finally reached, he was certainly nearer that kingdom at the end of his career than at the beginning.

For Mill's religious opinions we need not go outside the 'Three Essays' which were published after his death. The first is on 'Nature,' and the second on the 'Utility of Religion.'² The third is 'Theism.'³ The first Essay might be called an impeachment of nature for her crimes, cruelties and immoralities. Nature is the wild animal, and man is the being whose work is to tame and civilise. Nature is not to be followed or imitated but to be observed. It is such as no

¹ See 'Life after Death,' 'Palinodia,' and 'This and the other World.'

² Supposed to have been written between 1850 and 1858.

³ Written between 1868 and 1870.

being who had the attributes of justice or benevolence could have created. The great forces which strike us with awe and sometimes admiration are reckless in their action. They care for nothing which is dear or precious to man. 'Nearly all things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing to one another are natural every-day performances.'¹ Nature not only kills but kills with cruelty. She 'impales men, breaks them as if on a wheel, casts them to the wild beasts,' in short, she is not surpassed in ingenious cruelty by a Nabis or a Domitian.

Writers on Natural Theology try to make it appear that the suffering in the world exists to prevent greater suffering, that misery exists to prevent misery. If this thesis could be made good, it would only avail to justify the work of a limited being compelled to labour under unwilling conditions. It is out of place on the supposition of the Creator being omnipotent. The old Deists deified Nature. They set her up as the standard of morality, but goodness is in man, not in nature. Her very instincts and impulses are evil.

In the second Essay the theology of consciousness is examined. The learned Theists of this class take up with some form of the intuitional philosophy, and from internal feeling infer objective truth. The question now is if religion is not sustainable by argument, is it useful or necessary to the welfare of mankind? The answer is that the hope of immortality may be useful, yet history bears out the idea that man may be happy without such a belief. In a higher and even a happier condition of life it might be that man would not wish to be chained to existence, and would prefer annihilation to immortality.

In the third Essay the writer works his way to some shadows of belief. He first considers Natural Religion, that is, the common belief that God created and governs the world. To disprove this nothing can be found, at the same time nothing to prove it. The first argument is that for a First Cause. This is inferred from the fact that every effect has a cause, but causation can only be applied to the changeable phenomena of the world, and not legitimately extended to the material universe itself. Moreover, our knowledge of

¹ p. 28.

causes is merely sequence and cannot be carried back to the First Cause. Some have supposed volition identical with a real cause. The will produces an effect, but will always assumes force, and there is no ground for supposing that force was created by volition. So far as we have the means of judging, other agents besides will have power over phenomena. Mind may be the product of unconscious power. For that which has no beginning, no cause is needed. Matter and force so far as experience teaches us had no beginning. The argument thus fails for a First Cause. That for general consent resolves itself into the argument on which the general belief rests. That from consciousness has no validity as the idea in the mind does not prove the external object. There is no passage from the subjective to the objective. One argument has scientific value. The argument from design. There is design in nature. The eye was made to see. Here is evidence of an intelligent will. Nature shows a Deity, but only of limited power. The very idea of contrivance implies limitation. God may be omniscient but there is nothing to prove it. The wisdom manifested in Creation is beyond man's wisdom, but there is nothing to prove it infinite. Nature has no moral end. It seeks not the good of the sentient creature. There may be in creation traces of benevolence, but that is not its sole nor even its chief purpose. If that was its intention the failure has been ignominious.

After Natural Theology comes the question of Revelation. The latter has a starting-point in the former. It professes to be a message from a Being, whose existence is, at least, indicated in nature. The very imperfection of Natural Theology removes some of the stumbling blocks of Revelation. This was Butler's argument, and so far as it went, was valid, but Butler did not face the fact that the God of Nature is not omnipotent. If we can believe that God regards the happiness of His creatures, we may believe a revelation probable, but the supernatural evidence for Christianity is not sufficient. From what we know of the Divine government it is likely that God made provision in his scheme of creation for revelation by natural development, and from what we know of the history of the human mind, we may infer that that is really what has been done. Christianity thus becomes the un-

folding of a purpose as old as creation. A Divine Person is held up as a standard of excellence, and a model for imitation. It is not the God of the Jews, nor the God of nature, but God Incarnate. It is the Divine Man that has taken such a hold on the modern mind. Whatever rational criticism may take away it cannot take the Christ. None of the disciples of Jesus, nor of their proselytes could have invented the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or imagined His life and character in the Gospels. There is no one in the world's history to be compared with the Prophet of Nazareth.

Thomas Carlyle's biographer¹ has summed up his religious opinions partly from his books but mostly from his conversation. He is described as a Calvinist without the theology. He retained the substance while dropping the form, for what was really left was the effect on himself. The stern creed which made him what he was, he rejected, but in character and conduct he had much of the old Scotch Puritan. He was educated for the ministry in the Church of Scotland, but he early told his friend Irving that he had ceased to believe in any external revelation depending on the evidence of historical miracles. He was conscious of darkness rather than of light, and his few gleams of faith seemed more like coruscations than actual fire. He is commonly called a Pantheist; but there is a spiritual Pantheism, and a materialist Pantheism, and all kinds of Pantheism between. It is hard to believe that any thinking man is not a Pantheist of some kind. God was not personal. To believe that would be anthropomorphism. He is often named in the plural as the 'Eternities,' the 'Infinities,' the 'Immensities.' As man has intellect and conscience so must have that Being who is infinitely greater than man. He is the Soul of the world, not far from anyone of us, but in us and around us. He governs with absolute justice. Revelation and inspiration are in man. The breath of the Almighty giveth him understanding. Materialism is only 'mud philosophy,' for the Deity is behind and through all matter. The root of creation is spirit. The most manifest thing in the world is the distinction between right and wrong. Man's first business is duty—to do the right. A life to come is not improbable. Carlyle rated

¹ J. A. Froude.

forms of positive unbelief as much as he rated some forms of positive belief. He is not more severe on 'Puseyism, Free Kirk of Scotland, and such rubbish,' than he is on Strauss, Renan, and Colenso. He could not believe that historical Christianity would be much longer received by educated men, yet God, in His own time, would build up a temple for Himself on the ruins of the old belief. Samuel Wilberforce and Thomas Erskine regarded Carlyle as a deeply religious man. Though he set aside the supernatural, or rather identified it with the natural, he always told his mother that he believed as she did. In his last days he read the Bible much, and 'found it as deep and wonderful as it ever used to be.'

James Anthony Froude¹ the brother of Richard Hurrell Froude was early associated with the Tractarians at Oxford. He was engaged by Newman to write some of the lives of the Saints, but he was soon convinced that he was in 'a region of Will o' the Wisp superstitions and could only find legends where he expected history.' The 'Nemesis of Faith'² was understood at one time to represent Froude's own mental history, but this has been denied. It may, however, be taken as representing the writer's attitude towards orthodox forms of Christianity. The hero is a student who cannot subscribe to the established creeds because he has come to believe that the Bible is not generically different from other books.

Froude wrote but little on theological subjects and has nowhere categorically declared his belief. He was no friend to Ritualists or Roman Catholics, and in ecclesiastical history his sympathies were with the Puritans and the much depreciated writers of the eighteenth century. Dr Newman had wished for 'something deeper and truer than that which satisfied the eighteenth century.' On this Froude wrote, 'A good many years, perhaps a good many hundreds of years, will have to pass before such sound books will be written again or deeds done with such pith and mettle.' Before the Tractarian movement, the Church, though not perfect, had done its work satisfactorily. The Ritualistic movement was of no more significance than that of the spirit-rapper. The serious forces of the world will go on in spite of it. He quoted with approbation the saying of a Professor of astronomy that the

¹ B. 1818, d. 1894.

² 1848.

obligation of a Tractarian to go to Rome was in the ratio of the obtuseness of his understanding. He however, strange to say, defended Tract XC on the ground that Elizabeth and her ministers wished the Articles to be so framed that they might be subscribed by all who simply disavowed allegiance to the Pope.

The Roman Catholic Church Froude calls the enemy of the human race. The evidence he finds in history. Of the Puritans he wrote, 'We must judge of a creed by its effects on character, as we judge of the wholesomeness of food as it is conducive to bodily health. And the creed which swept like a wave through England at this time, and recommended itself to the noblest and most powerful intellects, produced also in those who accepted it a horror of sin, an enthusiasm for justice, piety, and manliness, which can be paralleled only in the first ages of Christianity.'¹ Froude never lost interest in historical questions and the development of religious influence, but theology was to him in confusion inextricable.

Matthew Arnold was the son of Dr Arnold of Rugby. Three of his books may be named in which he sets forth his interpretation of Christianity with some variations, and many repetitions. These books are 'God and the Bible,' 'St Paul and Protestantism,' and 'Literature and Dogma.' He speaks of the extravagance of German criticism, giving as an instance the exaggeration of the difference between St Peter and St Paul, and the theory that the Acts of the Apostles was written to wipe out the memory of the strife. He also spoke of Bishop Colenso's criticism as destructive and nothing else. Before we take anything away, we should know what we are to put in its place. As a fact of experience man cannot do without the Christian religion, yet it is equally true that he cannot do with it as it is. The Christianity which was planted in Europe was corrupt, but in the state in which Europe then was, this was the only form in which it could have been propagated. Its success is due in part to the belief in miracles, but it was also due to some elements in the personality and words of Jesus.

Popular theology and learned theology are alike founded

¹ See Bunyan in *Men of Letters*, p. 23.

on a misapprehension of the meaning of the Bible. The God of popular theology is a legend or fairy-tale. A personal God has to be proved by miracles and metaphysics. Now miracles may be true, but it is impossible to prove that they ever happened. The resurrection and ascension of Jesus may be true, but we have no evidence of their truth. Christianity must be apprehended from another side. We must learn the method of Jesus, His secret, and His sweet reasonableness.

The second book mentioned is preceded by an introduction on the Church of England and Puritanism. The writer was a great admirer of St Paul, but his sympathies were not strongly with the Puritans. Their doctrines of original sin, atonement, justification and predestination are founded on a misapprehension of St Paul. The Evangelicals and Non-conformists perpetuate these false conceptions of St Paul's meaning, and the latter by their separation have cut themselves off from outgrowing their errors. Theoretically they have all made their doctrines 'the gospel,' and so have lost the faculty of growth, yet practically they have rested in St Paul's true doctrine, 'Let him that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.' The kingdom of God is founded in goodness, not in metaphysics. The upright are the orthodox, and the wicked are the heretics.

M. Renan had written of St Paul's doctrine, that after having been for three hundred years, thanks to Protestantism, the Christian doctrine, *par excellence*, Paul is now coming to the end of his reign. Renan had a distaste for Protestantism, and this extends to Paul. The reign of the Protestant may be coming to an end, but not the reign of St Paul. That is only in its beginning. There are several causes why he has been misunderstood. One is the Puritan principle that to understand the Bible it was not necessary to know any other book. Another cause is taking his emotional language as scientific. Faith for instance, with St Paul is an emotion leading to action. He was no Antimonian.

The common view of Puritan theology is, calling, justification, satisfaction; but with St Paul it is *dying with Christ, resurrection* from the dead, and growing into Christ. Real life begins with the mystical death which passes from the external *shall* or *shall not* of the law. Original sin is that which is

actual, within us ‘the law in the members warring against the law of the mind.’ The allusion to dying in Adam was merely St Paul’s rhetoric. He knew nothing of a sacrificial atonement. The only substitution is that by which the believer in his own person repeats Christ’s dying for sin. If the popular theology is found even in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is the fault of the reader rather than of the writer.

The title of the third book indicates the author’s meaning. Literature or culture, if brought to the interpretation of the Bible, will dissolve the popular dogmas. The assumption with which the Churches and sects set out that there is a great personal First Cause, the moral and intelligent Governor of the universe, and that from Him the Bible derives its authority, can never be verified. We must find a basis for the Bible in something which can be proved, instead of something which has to be assumed. The true basis is found in the rational side of Christianity, not in miraculous fulfilment of prophecies, but in realising the Eternal, the Not-ourselves, which is working for righteousness.

‘Ecce Homo,’ or a survey of the life and work of Jesus Christ,¹ was probably suggested by the many Lives of Jesus which had been written during this century, especially by that of M. Renan. The writer proposed to take no heed of either doctors or apostles, but simply to look at the facts and see what they appeared to warrant when critically weighed. Jesus was preceded by the Baptist who said that He who was to come after him was to baptise with fire. He was to kindle enthusiasm. In themselves miracles are improbable, yet those of Jesus are best accounted for on the hypothesis that they were really performed. The professed object of Jesus was to establish a kingdom. This idea was developed out of the Old Testament. As a matter of fact Jesus founded a divine society which has existed for two thousand years, and is to-day in full vigour. The first disciples had no elaborate creed. That was not possible for them. Christians of the present time believe much more than they did. The object of the kingdom was that God’s will might be done on earth as it is in heaven. Of this society Christ was King. The members were to be bound to each other by the closest ties.

¹ Published 1866.

While Socrates and other great teachers taught by argument, Jesus taught by personal authority. They worked on the intellect, He on the heart. He kindled the enthusiasm of humanity. The society which he established is not yet perfect, but it descended from God out of heaven.

The author of 'Ecce Homo' promised a second part which never appeared. In a treatise on 'Natural Religion,' 1882, he spoke of the supernatural as not essential to religion but merely accidental. The theist can dispense with a personal will or with miracles, as he has in nature a most impressive theology, a most awful and glorious God. Nature is infinitely interesting and infinitely beautiful. Here we are in the presence of an Infinite and an Eternal Being. We can only contemplate Him with awe and admiration. It may seem to some that science kills religion and poetry, but as Goethe said, 'It has given back to imagination as much as it took away.' The knowledge of nature is the knowledge of God. It may be said that nature is ruthless and unrelenting, but under the term nature we must include human nature, which to us must ever be the most important side. Natural religion is the worship of whatever in the known universe is worthy of worship. The writer restricts his inquiry to the question of how much science and religion have in common, and how religion is to be preserved when the supernatural is gone.

'Supernatural Religion.' A work in three volumes with this title published in 1874 caused considerable controversy. It was anonymous and report ascribed it to Bishop Thirlwall, who was retiring from his see,¹ and was believed to be undoing the work of his lifetime by denying the reality of miracles and external revelation. In the belief that it was the work of the learned Bishop, the critics praised it for its great critical skill and erudition. Dr Lightfoot, afterwards Bishop of Durham, wrote a series of papers on it in the *Contemporary Review*, not so much refuting the arguments as showing the inaccurate scholarship of the author.

The only reason for noting it here is the criticism of some arguments in defence of miracles. The work was described by its author as the result of many years' investigation under-

¹ It has generally been ascribed to a nephew of Dr Pusey, who withheld his name because of the great reputation of his uncle as an orthodox theologian.

taken for the regulation of personal belief. He had not ceased to believe in Jesus in some sense, but it was Jesus without Paul, who is reckoned the author of ecclesiastical Christianity and who is said to have almost effaced the true work of Jesus.¹ He saw no significance in the divine life, but concentrated all interest in the death and resurrection of his Messiah.

Ecclesiastical theology which began with St Paul, has been the bane of true Christianity. It is practically abandoned in our popular theology but not explicitly. The miraculous elements, that is all the doctrines which alone constitute the claims of Christianity to be a divine Revelation, are thrown to the wolves of doubt and unbelief. What is left has not one feature to distinguish it as a miraculously communicated religion. It is thus an absurdity to claim a supernatural character for doctrines clipped and pruned down to the standard of human reason. There is no more warrant to abandon that which does not accord with reason than to retain what is reasonable.

The avowed object of the writer is to ascertain whether or not Christianity is a divine supernatural revelation. He finds discrepancies in the doctrines and also in the evidences. Some appeal to the Bible as infallible ; others maintain that the great doctrines of ecclesiastical Christianity cannot be deduced from the Bible. If then the Church is not infallible we have no certainty. Ecclesiastical Christianity claims to be miraculous. It is therefore absurd to think that the doctrines can be held while the miraculous is rejected. The author has before him chiefly the arguments for miracles put forward by such writers as Dr Mozley and Dean Mansel. The latter, following the old evidence writers, such as Butler and Paley, makes miracles necessary to a revelation, they must stand or fall together. Mozley's language is even stronger. He says that such a revelation as Jesus professed to give could not be believed without miracles. They are part of the structure and cannot be abandoned without abandoning the whole.

Archbishop Trench maintained that a doctrine must in itself be good before a miracle could seal it as divine, for the

¹ Vol. iii, p. 567.

kingdom of lies had its miracles as well as the kingdom of truth. Dr Arnold said that it was only through our belief in the Gospels that we accord our belief to miracles. But Mozley maintains that a supernatural fact is the proper proof of a supernatural doctrine. With this the author agrees calling it absurd to talk of the internal evidence of doctrine so monstrous and incredible as the dogmas of ecclesiastical Christianity. They are beyond human reason, and therefore by human reason cannot be proved. But the evidence of miracles is worthless if they may be either divine or satanic. Though Dr Mozley lays down the right principle that miracles are absolutely necessary to certify what reason cannot discover, he yet confesses that no miracle can oblige us to receive what is contrary to our moral nature, so the final appeal after all is to reason. Trench makes miracles natural, for if unnatural they would be ungodly, and therefore not a divine work. This is called quibbling on the word *natural* to avoid a dilemma. Dr Newman did not resort to this device, but said without hesitation that walking on the sea was a plain reversal of the law of the natural world.

Mozley's Bampton Lectures were addressed mainly to the fundamental question of the acceptability of miracles. He assumed the fact of the Scripture miracles, and then discussed the question of their referribleness to unknown law. But the question is concerning these miracles whether or not they were real, and when this is settled in the affirmative then is the time to go on to the question of their relation to the order of nature. But of these miracles we have only the record. We have no means of testing whether or not they were ever wrought. The Bampton lecturer first considered if they could be referred to an unknown connection with a known law, and admitted that this could not be done. He then considered if they might be related to a higher law not yet discovered, but if this were discovered it would be a new law of nature, and so miracles would not be less a revolution of the order of nature than of the present order. Both Mozley and Mansel had argued from the action of the human will to an efficient cause as distinct from physical causes. The example given is that of throwing a stone which is an efficient cause at the command of the human will. We

have only to substitute the Divine will for the human, a personal Head in nature whose free will penetrates the universal frame, and the suspension of physical laws is conceivable. A miracle then becomes as natural as a chemical experiment. The answer to this is that an efficient cause, such as the will divine or human produces, is no disturbance of physical law. The laws of life act among the laws of matter but not independent of them.

Mozley argued that there is really no order of nature. What we call such is merely the order observed by us. Antecedently to experience, to take a step and to ascend into heaven are equally credible or incredible. There may be suspension of the present order of nature for a providential purpose. On this supposition a miracle is not an anomaly or irregularity, but part of the system of the Universe. Here the author finds nothing but assumptions. A divine revelation is assumed because it is believed to have been given. But the doctrines of the supposed Revelation are incredible, and so, therefore are the miracles by which it is said to be evidenced. Mozley said it was irrational to believe that what had been in the past must be in the future, and that there is no proof of the existence of a permanent cause. To this the answer was that it was more irrational to believe what was contrary to experience than to believe what was in accordance with experience. The future is more likely to be like the past than unlike it.

To these advocates of the theology of consciousness, we may add Frances Power Cobbe. Her belief in the actual communion of the soul with the Divine is as ardent as that of any Neo-Platonist, Christian Pietist, or Mystic. In a book on the tendencies of religious thought in England at the present time, the various parties in the Church and out of it are criticised,¹ and their errors and failings made manifest. The ark of faith is compared to the ark of old when sent forth by the Philistines to be carried whithersoever the cattle might be divinely appointed to bear it. 'The tabernacle in which our fathers worshipped does not stand on the old ground, and we are striving with strained eyes to

¹ See 'Broken Lights, or an Inquiry into the Present Conditions and Future Prospect of Religious Faith, 1864.'

know what the future is to be.¹ Those who believe that God has made a supernatural revelation in past times are called Traditionalists. Those who believe that He is revealing Himself at all times through reason and conscience are called Rationalists. The writer avows adherence to the latter, making faith to depend on consciousness and needing no historical revelation to reveal God or duty. Those who cling to the old theology and try to harmonise its doctrines with the new ideas are called Palæologians. Those who modify the old doctrines so as to fit them to meet the new ideas are called Neologians. The Palæologians are divided into the well-known Church parties of High and Low. With the one the Bible is authenticated and interpreted by the Church. The Bible says that the Church has the promise of divine guidance, and therefore what it says of the Bible must be true. The authority of the one is based mutually on the authority of the other. The Low Church party have strong convictions because their views are narrow. Believing in the utter depravity of man, they cannot accept the doctrine of consciousness, and must therefore, have an external authority. They take the Bible and the Bible alone. But it has now been found that the Bible is not infallible.

The Neologians seek to harmonise the Church and the Bible, and give more weight to reason than the other two. They try to interpret the Bible so as to make it agree with every discovery in science. They are divided into two classes. The first is the Broad Church represented by such men as Maurice and Kingsley. Their mode of harmonising is to evade every point of special difficulty, or to offer instead of an explanation, some beautiful moral or spiritual truth. Instead of a clear light at the end of an argument, they leave a luminous haze of thought. Like the Palæologians, they believe that the inspiration of the Bible differs in kind from that of other books. The second Broad Church differs from this by supposing that the inspiration is the same in kind but not in degree. It also appeals to history, but history corroborated by consciousness. History is no foundation for religion. This is not to be gained by study nor by reasoning. It is a revelation to the soul and may be possessed by the

¹ Pref.

humblest heart while denied to the clearest intellect. It can only be gained 'by prayer and kept by obedience.'¹ It is not concerned with questions of the age, authority or reliability of books. Its foundation is in the consciousness of humanity.

¹ p. 114.

CHAPTER XIX

CONCLUSION

IT was said in the preface that the writer's object was to record, not to judge. It seemed an impertinence to be thrusting his opinions into every page and refuting everything with which he did not agree. It may, however, be allowed to review the ground we have traversed, and mark the questions which may fairly be considered as settled.

The first was subscription to the Articles of religion. It may now be admitted by all that the compilers of them were Calvinists in doctrine and strongly Protestant, that they gave expression to their beliefs without any effort at concealment or compromise. It is remarkable that among the many who have undertaken to prove the Articles not Calvinistic no one has thought of comparing them with Calvin's Institutes, in which often the very phraseology will be found, as in the definition of a Church, where the Word of God is preached and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ,¹ and again where baptism is called 'a kind of sealed instrument.'¹ Much of Calvin is also in Hooker, as the famous passage about some who receive the sacraments of God's grace, and do not receive the grace of God. Calvin's words are, 'though the sacraments were common to all, the grace was not common to all.' The same may be found in St Augustine. In fact Church of England theology is that of St Augustine as moulded and formulated by Calvin. Article XVII may be a mild form of predestination, but it is redolent of Calvinistic

¹ B. IV, i, 9.

² B. IV, xvi.

piety.¹ It follows then that only the few persons in the Church of England who are doctrinal Calvinists and clearly Protestant, subscribe the Articles in their original and natural sense. All others sign with a qualification or explanation. This is a natural and normal condition. The Articles have their stamp from the controversies of the time in which they were written. They express the ideas of the men of that age. We subscribe them as substantially true, though not in every detail, nor as if incapable of improvement. This is not the same as subscribing them when we believe the opposite, and it is fairer than to read our own interpretation into them and call it the original. That they remain the standard of doctrine 'with some few corrections' was advocated by Bishop Burnet nearly two hundred years ago.²

The subject of evidences has been discussed from various standpoints all through the century. Many arguments in answer to objections from discoveries in science have by necessity been abandoned. And the defence in a new form has continued after the facts which had been thought inimical were admitted. Astronomy, geology, evolution, each in its turn the terror of the theologian, has in the end been found not only harmless but often helpful. Christianity is now viewed more in its substance than its form. The outward manifestation may change and vary with the age, while the inward is something which by its own strength and evidence will survive every revolution of opinion and every change of form.

The two kinds of evidence, external and internal, need not be brought into collision. Neither is a demonstration, yet each has a validity in its own sphere. The external may

¹ Since the above was written, the author has read that Edward Spencer, Vicar of Winkfield, Wilts, 'addressed a letter in elegant Latin to his friend, the Rev. Dr Haweis, in which the Calvinism of the 17th Article was fully established by a comparison of the original in passages from the Institutes, in which not only the harmony of the sentiments but the identity of the expressions was made most manifestly to appear.' See *Evangelical Magazine* for 1819, p. 397-8. The author cannot find out if this letter was ever printed. It may be said that all which Calvin taught in its extreme form is not in the Article, but all which the Article teaches is in Calvin.

² 'His own Times' vol. iv, 410.

point to probabilities and it may meet objections. If the matter of a revelation is good, the external evidence may increase its credibility. If on the other hand, it is bad if opposed to reason or morality, no external evidence can be sufficient. Miracles which we have not seen but know only from the testimony of men who lived long ago, cannot be strong evidence to us. On the contrary they are rather a hindrance in the way of belief. When explained as not supernatural, but within the order of nature they really cease to be miracles, except in appearance. If we believe that the order of nature is fixed, we may not conceive of departures from it, except when a great object is to be served. The question is not the possibility but the probability of miracles. Is it likely that the miracles of the New Testament ever happened? The answer will be affirmative, if we are disposed to believe in Christianity, and negative if we are not so disposed. Evidence they cannot be, till we have first come within the region of belief. The same may be said of prophecy. There is no evidence from direct fulfilment of single prophecies, but from the predictive element which runs through the Old Testament centring in the coming of a great One who was to be descended from Abraham and David. The truth of Christianity must be felt. In Coleridge's phrase, there is something in it which finds men—something which has the ring of truth, which they feel to be true, and which will be felt while there is a human heart to feel. Internal evidence has its validity in the fact that the multitudes who believe in Christianity are like the man in the Gospel. They can only say that once they were blind and now they see.

One thing is certain, whatever else might be doubtful. That one thing is the sense of sin and of righteousness. The dogmatic expression of Christianity in many respects may often be defective but the truth which influences the life can never die. The earnest clergy and the converted people of the last century were once the objects of reproach and contempt, but all is changed. The names once despised are now honoured, what was once denounced as enthusiasm is now called the work of the Spirit of God. Methodists and Evangelicals may be in the background when viewed from the standpoint of advanced theology, but they are still powerful factors

in the religious life, the best of all witnesses for that in Christianity which is indestructible.

Those who call themselves Theists usually prefer to have the appellation of Christian prefixed. They do not wish to be on the merely negative side. They incline to the belief that in some way God has revealed and is revealing Himself. One of them has endorsed the words of Bishop Butler concerning Christianity 'that it is not so clear that there is nothing in it,'¹

The controversy about the three witnesses,² is finally closed. The unanimous verdict of all scholars is that the verse is not genuine. It has been omitted in the revised version of the New Testament. The controversy is an instance of how some men will fight for whatever seems to be for their opinion, however strong the evidence to the contrary. It was the same spirit which raised opposition to Bishop Marsh's speculations on the origin of the synoptical gospels. These speculations may not have been any nearer the truth than others on the same subject, but they interfered with the received view which had no special claim to be the true one. Fear of ultimate consequences should never be thought of in the legitimate search for truth. Two tendencies are generally manifest in religious belief. One is to grasp at anything which promises external authority if it be only the proverbial straw of the drowning man. The other tendency is towards conclusions the contrary of what are taught by external authority. The one may end in fetishism, the other in scepticism. The goal of the one may be belief in anything; the goal of the other belief in nothing. In our century these two tendencies have occupied every possible stage.

The Oxford movement was in the direction of authority. That of the Church had long been renounced, and that of the Bible was open to the objection that though the Bible might be infallible, the interpretation of it was not, unless the Church had authority to interpret. The Bible might be true, but our understanding of it which is that which touches us might be false. The natural conclusion is that we must turn to the Church. We have the interpretation of the Church in the Creeds, the Catechism, and the Articles of Religion. But

¹ See S. Hennell.

² St John v. 7.

what Church is it whose interpretation is there given? For the Creeds it is the old Catholic or undivided Church, for the Catechism and Articles it is the Reformed Church of England. These apparently two Churches must be proved to be one.

This was the task of the Tractarian writers. We had the same creeds, the same hierarchy, the same constitution as the old universal Church. But there exists another Church which claims to be *the* Catholic Church, which though it may have varied in doctrine from the undivided Church of the first ages, yet has an unbroken succession from it, and a communion without a shadow of external interruption. The Church of England was once one with this Church. It is now separated. Can this separation be justified, and the English Church remain identified with the primitive universal Church? To maintain the affirmative of this was the object of the writers just mentioned. The leader of the movement with many of his followers found it could not be maintained, and joined the Church of Rome to make sure of their identity with the old Catholic Church.

Those who remained in the Church of England still maintained the affirmative. But how to get over the Reformation was their great labour. Some justified it as the work of Catholic men who, as constituting a national Hierarchy, had a right to manage their own affairs. The Reformation is thus made the work of the Church, and the Protestant doctrines are so explained as to bear what is called a Catholic sense.

Another party found that the Reformation was not the work of Ecclesiastics, nor were the Ecclesiastics who went with it Catholic men or men that held Catholic doctrines. They were cast in the same mould as the Continental Reformers, in doctrine, Calvinists and Zwinglians, and their baneful influence rested on the English Church until it was expelled by Laud and other Catholic men like him. It was by the good providence of God that Queen Elizabeth preserved Catholic worship when her bishops were deforming it under pretence of reforming the Church. The separation from Rome is supposed to be justified, though not the means by which it was effected.

The question of the Reformation in England and how it affects the connection with the whole Catholic Church, rests

mainly on the consecration of Matthew Parker. Warham was responsible for the submission of the clergy, but the influence of the king was not unfelt. Cranmer carried out the will of Edward or of Edward's advisers, without whose help he could never have effected the changes he made. But hitherto there was no question of the validity of a consecration. Cranmer was consecrated papally, ecclesiastically, civilly. But not so Parker. He was civilly not papally, and it is doubted if ecclesiastically. When Elizabeth came to the throne the bishops with only one exception refused to take the oath of supremacy. The Queen commanded four of them to consecrate Parker. They declined, and were deprived, but only by the authority of Elizabeth, not by any ecclesiastical power. Elizabeth got four Protestant bishops who had been deprived of their sees under Mary, to perform the consecration. The validity of this is upheld on the ground that three bishops can consecrate. The number three is from a Canon of the Council of Nicæa, which says that a bishop must be made by all the bishops of the province, and if they cannot all come together three will suffice, provided they have the written sanction of the others. The object of this canon plainly is that the appointment of a bishop shall be the work of the province, so as to be the work of the whole Catholic Church. The validity does not rest on the number of bishops consecrating, but on their having the sanction of the whole province represented by all the bishops. This the consecrators of Parker had not. The bishops of the province were not ecclesiastically deprived. The consecrating bishops had no sanction but that of the Queen. They were not even bishops in office. They were only elect. So the point is not the number of bishops consecrating but their having the sanction of the whole Church. One bishop who has this sanction is more likely to perform a valid consecration than three who have it not. It is impossible now to escape the conclusion that the English Reformation was essentially Erastian, that Erastianism is so burnt into the bones of the Church of England, that it can never be effaced. Efforts have been made for its obliteration but *Naturam expelles furca, tamen usque recurret*.¹ The next line might be added that she will break through the *mala fastidia*

¹ Horace, Epis. X, L. 1, l. 24.

which are not consonant to her constitution. The identity of the Church of England with the Church before the Reformation can only be maintained on the principle that the people and not the succession of bishops constitute the Church. The civil ruler and the Parliament representing the laity reformed the Church, and in this sense the Church of England reformed itself.

Baptismal regeneration is a subject that has been much in controversy, and much of the disputation has arisen from the want of a common definition of the word regeneration. That men who had been baptised were reckoned regenerated in the early ages of Christianity is not to be denied. A convert was believed to be what he professed to be, and so everyone that had been initiated into the Church was reckoned a new-born man. This form of speech continued in the Church and was carefully retained by our Reformers, just because it was primitive, and, so, Catholic. When associated with the idea of the transmission of grace by the Church, regeneration was naturally connected with the act of baptism in every case. When mixed up with the doctrines of Calvin, which are now generally admitted to have been the doctrines of our Reformers, it took the form of regeneration on condition of the fulfilment of promises made in baptism, or, to speak more Calvinistically, it was only for the elect, as grace once given could never be lost.

The senses in which regeneration was understood were many. The Tractarian writers, as we have seen, took it in the sense of absolute purity. The baptised child was spotless as an angel, the holiest thing on earth. Some made it the sowing of a seed of good, which if cared for might bear much fruit. Those who followed reason more than theory asked for the evidence that the mere act of baptism produced any internal effect. If it did it must be momentary, for children of the Church of England duly baptised do not show more signs of grace and goodness than the children of Baptists or Quakers who have not received baptism.

The tendency in the negative direction has been followed as far as the denial of all external authority in religion. Men have become famous according as they have lifted up the axe on the old Bible. Froude, the historian, says that 'the most

advanced Biblical critic in 1810 would have closed the Speaker's commentary with dismay and indignation'¹ but Froude must have forgotten Bishop Marsh. Alexander Geddes may be reckoned as one born out of due season, and his obscure position as a Roman Catholic priest under the ban of the authorities of his Church may have helped to stifle any influence which he might have had. Moreover, all he said was an importation from Germany, and it might as well have been taken to the centre of the dark continent as to the England of that time.

The 'Essays and Reviews' controversy was finally minimised to the question of the inspiration of the Bible, and never-ending punishment, both of which were left open, as no article defines or decides either. They have since been calmly discussed by men of different denominations and different views. Canon Farrar² made Never-Ending Punishment the subject of a course of sermons, which were published under the title of 'Eternal Hope.' The preacher's object was to prove an intermediary state in which probation or discipline continued until the day of judgment, in opposition to the ordinary belief that the final condition of every man is determined at the end of this life. Four views of Eschatology were considered. The first was called Universalism, the doctrine that all men will be ultimately saved. This was set aside not as untrue but as not clearly taught in the Scriptures, and because it is impossible for us to estimate the hardening effects of persistence in evil. The second was called Annihilation, or Conditional Immortality, which meant that after another probation the finally impenitent would cease to exist. This was described as the ghastly conclusion, that God will raise the wicked from the dead, only that they may be finally destroyed. The third was Purgatory, which, if without the Romish accretions and regarded simply as a purification by fire is not inconsistent with Scripture. The fourth is the common view the most untenable of all.

The preacher maintained that his views accorded with Catholic theology both before and since the Reformation, for no decree or dogma of the Church Catholic had ever declared punishment to be everlasting, or condemned those who

¹ 'Good Words,' 1881.

² Now Dean of Canterbury.

believe in final restoration. His views were opposed only to the present Catholic or general opinion, which was founded on a misunderstanding, and a mistranslation of the original words of Scripture.

These words were chiefly three, damnation, hell and eternal. The first really meant judgment, condemnation, and the word by which it is translated, probably meant the same at the time when our translation was made. Hell, in the Old Testament, is *Sheol* the underworld. In the New it is represented by three Greek words Tartarus, which is an intermediate state, Hades, also an intermediary place, and for both good and bad, and Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, into which the corpses of criminals were cast, and where a fire was kept constantly burning for the purification of the air. The word translated eternal is often predicated of things which are finite. It does not necessarily mean everlasting, and often it means merely indefinite. Literally it is age-long, in a secondary or spiritual sense, it is that which transcends time. The Jewish Gehenna was not a place of endless torment, and according to the Talmud there was only temporary punishment for the worst of sinners. There is nothing in Scripture to prove that the fate of every man is at death irreversibly determined. We may be lost here as well as in the other world, but as Christ came to seek and to save the lost, there is hope that the vast majority at any rate of the lost may be found.

Carlyle had spoken of miserable degraded beings on whom the genius of darkness had set his seal and whom it was impossible ever to command by love. But Jesus Christ never spoke in this fashion of any class of men. There was hope for the very worst, and even beyond the grave the love of Christ may constrain those whom it did not reach in this life. On the other hand we know not how long or how far some men may continue even beyond the grave to harden themselves against this love. The consequences of sin may be irreversible, so that eternal hope gives no encouragement to those who make light of sin.

Canon Farrar's sermons gave rise to considerable controversy. The subject was discussed in a symposium in

the *Contemporary Review*, when all was said about it that could be said.¹ Some of the writers were very hostile. Canon Farrar said that nine-tenths of what they had triumphantly refuted was what he had never maintained. The majority, however, more or less agreed with him. One saw in the popularity of these sermons the increased weight given to the verdict of the moral sense on every doctrine prepared for man's reception.² Another³ said that the light of real knowledge cannot be carried beyond the sphere of time and space which now conditions all our powers of knowing, and it would have been well for the progress of theology if long ago, these limitations had been admitted. The subject was summed up in the words of Butler, that everyone would be equally dealt with and would receive according to what he had done. As, however, we dare not limit the mercy of God, so on the other hand none can tell to what awful depths the wickedness of man may reach, or what irremediableness of punishment may cleave to it in the way of natural consequence. Wickedness may make a hell upon earth, and so it may in the future make a hell as everlasting as itself. A third writer⁴ said that he pleaded for the destruction of the work of the devil in the universe. He hoped that hell would be destroyed, Christ triumphant gathering the spoils of His cross and passion here and in all worlds. Another critic⁵ said that if ever there was a Catholic doctrine, it was that of never-ending punishment. It had been taught by all Churches in all ages, by Fathers, Schoolmen, Reformers, zealous Roman Catholics and ardent Protestants. But if tried by Bishop Butler's rule, that reason is 'the only faculty which we have to judge of anything, even revelation,' it stands condemned. A necessary part of belief in revelation is that God will be just, which he could not be if punishment is endless. Nothing which the worst of men could do in the compass of his three score and ten years could possibly deserve such a punishment as the endless torment of the

¹ The papers afterwards collected by James Hogg, and with an Essay by De Quincey on the meaning of 'eternal,' were republished under the title of the 'Wider Hope,' 1890.

² Professor Jellett.

³ Principal Tulloch.

⁴ Baldwin Brown.

⁵ The present writer.

hell of orthodox theology. The preacher thought that the Roman Catholic religion was more merciful than the Protestant, because it taught a Purgatory after this life, but Purgatory was only for the perfecting those who were to be saved. The picture which Roman Catholic writers had made of the never-ending torment of the lost was as revolting as anything to be found amongst Protestants. A very high Churchman¹ boasted that whatever might be the popular doctrine no council had ever formulated a decree against universal restoration. Origen's doctrine was not condemned. The creeds of the Church are silent on the subject. The words in the Athanasian which might seem an exception, are simply the words of Scripture, with no attempt at an explanation of what is meant by eternal. An advocate of conditional immortality² objected to the assumption that the soul was naturally immortal. Its life depended on the life-giving Spirit, and everlasting destruction was for those who refuse to submit to the moral government of God. Farrar's doctrine was described as giving to the generality of defiant men a cheerful and hopeful view of their ultimate destiny. The last that we need mention³ took the broad ground that we cannot believe the sin of this infinitesimal moment of time which we call life will remain engraved on the character throughout eternity. Past failure may supply a new stimulus for the future.

Canon Farrar replied to his critics. The substance of the reply was that he only advocated an intermediary probation or disciplinary state after death, and that the grace of God extended to the life to come. To the objection of giving hope to defiant men, he answered that so long as they are defiant, so long they must remain in outer darkness, which is alienation from God. It was finally maintained that Gehenna and æonian distinctly exclude the senses which have been popularly attached to them. The popular interpretation of them has been all but universal since the days of St Augustine. The original meaning has been gradually obscured by uncritical ignorance, but it has never been lost sight of by learned men.

In a symposium on the Inspiration or Infallibility of the

¹ Dr Littledale. ² Edward White. ³ Professor Mayor.

Bible,¹ this subject was treated in the same calm and liberal fashion. The form it took was an answer to the question, 'In what sense and within what limits is the Bible the Word of God?' The writers were of different denominations. A Churchman and a Wesleyan maintained broadly that the Bible is literally the Word of God. A Unitarian argued that the Bible never calls itself the Word of God; God's direct communications or authentic statements are not to be confounded with the words of the historian, the scribe or the poet. The Bible may be called the Word of God in the sense that a rose, a thistle, or a sunbeam is, for there is nothing outside of Deity. A Swedenborgian said that the Word of God was not a written book, but the presence among men of the Spirit of Jehovah. A Roman Catholic said that the Scriptures are the Word of God and infallibly true, so also are the decrees of a General Council. There is, however, this difference that the decrees of councils are the work of men not inspired but preserved from error by the Spirit of God, while the Scriptures are the work of inspired men. Inspiration does not extend to the words, but only to the subject matter. A Jew showed that among Jews there was the same variety of views as to inspiration as among Christians. Some said the Bible was the Word of God, others ascribed the same character to the oral law, and some said that the Bible only contained the Word of God. An Independent preacher² asked that we put aside for a time the idea of the New Testament as one volume. This was the work of those who formed the canon and is merely a human work. It will then be seen that the authors are as distinct as those of Greece and Rome. If we could read them in their original condition the absurdity of asserting for them all the same uniform quality of inspiration would be apparent. This was an afterthought of the Church which had its consummation in Protestantism, arising from the necessity of an infallible Book as against the Romish idea of an infallible Church. We believe the gospels from moral and intellectual reasons in the same way that we believe the veracity of any ordinary historian. If this cannot be done no solid belief can be attained by setting up a doctrine of

¹ 1885 *Nineteenth Century*.

² Edward White.

verbal inspiration. In the books which contain the dogmatic teaching of prophets and apostles we have a 'Thus saith the Lord,' but the sacred writers approach us each with a separate work and with different claims to inspiration. The Bible is the work of fifty different writers, of different ages with different degrees of illumination and many other things different. We should regulate our views of inspiration by the testimony which each gives to the degree in which he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

Canon Farrar summed up the argument and concluded the symposium. The orthodox writers who called the Bible the Word of God did not contribute one element to any categorical answer to the question. All the writers agreed that the books had a unique claim to our study and reverence, and it is really a secondary matter whether or not they are called the Word of God. The Bible is a record of God's revelation, but it is superstition of the worst kind to think of every word and letter as proceeding supernaturally from God. In the Prayer Book inspiration is always something present, a natural and continuous influence of the Spirit.

The stream of liberal tendency everywhere overflowing its banks has reached regions where it was least expected. The most remarkable of these manifestations is in a party who might be reckoned in the lineal succession from the Tractarian writers. The Librarian of the Pusey Library in Oxford edited a volume of Essays,¹ the avowed object of which was to put 'the Catholic faith into the right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems.'² The way of doing this was to have the faith 'disencumbered, re-interpreted and explained.' The Editor's own essay would have produced, fifty years ago, such a panic as followed Hampden's 'Bampton Lectures' or Milman's 'History of the Jews.' Even now it did not escape without some commotion, but even commotion has learned to be calm. The writer held by the theory of an inspired Church, while he set aside the infallibility of the Scriptures. This might recall the words of a famous essay in which the Bible is called the written voice of the congregation. The same spirit which inspired the Bible inspired also the Church, the world of nature, and of human life. A hard and fast line

¹ *Lux Mundi*, Charles Gore, 1889.

² Pref.

cannot be drawn between what is within and what is without the canon. For instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews is in, while the corresponding Epistle of Clement is out. Every race has had its inspiration and its prophets. Here we are reminded of an essay on the Education of the Human Race. The conclusions of recent critics of the Old Testament are treated favourably, including, for example, stages in the growth of the law of worship, especially the three marked by the Book of the Covenant, the Book of Deuteronomy and the Priestley code. Moses may have established a certain germ of ceremonial enactments in connection with the ark and its sacred tent, and with the 'ten words.' This may have developed into the law of Moses, which represents a later and less historical development of Israel's history than that given in Samuel and Kings. This is admitted to be an unconscious idealising of history, yet compatible with the idea of inspiration which would exclude anything like pious fraud or conscious deception. The very word idealising reminds us of the ideology in another essay in the once famous volume. Inspiration is not a miraculous communication of facts. The records in Genesis may be myths and yet inspired. Myth was the earliest form in which the mind of man apprehended truth. The Bible histories in the judgment of many of the Fathers were mere allegories.

The worst of the heresies of this essay are yet to come. Jesus brought no light on Old Testament history. He simply endorsed the views current among the Jews, though indeed He set forth that He was the goal to which it pointed. He did not settle any question of Old Testament literature. Jonah's resurrection was a type of His own, but He did not determine whether it was history or allegory. He spoke of eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage before the flood, but there is nothing of this in the original narrative. He argued with the Pharisees on the assumption that David was the author of Psalm CX, but this does not decide its authorship. He did not reveal His Godhead by any anticipation of natural knowledge. The incarnation implied limitation. It was a self-emptying of God to reveal Himself under conditions of human nature, and from the human point of view

He limited Himself to the scientific and historical knowledge of His time.

If light thus shone into one of the darkest corners of the Church of England, it is not surprising that we find it also in the Free Church of Scotland. William Robertson Smith was dismissed from the professorship of Hebrew because he had adopted the speculations of Wellhausen concerning the late origin of the Levitical law, and all the changed views of the structure of the Old Testament compiled in these speculations.¹ The Bible is inspired, but it has a human side as well as a divine. The writers were not mere passive channels through whose lips or pens God poured forth an abstract doctrine. On the contrary they had an intelligent share in the divine converse with them. If we are to understand the Divine Word this must be taken into account, just as in seeking to understand the conversation of a father we must consider what the child saw, knew or felt.² Bible revelation is a jewel set in human history. We must not suppose that the first recipients of revelation had the same knowledge of divine things which the later had. The Old Testament believers looked for a Messiah, but they had no such conceptions of the Messiah as now exist in the Christian Church.³

Some other Free Church writers have barely escaped the reproach of heresy. Professor Bruce, clearly following Maurice, distinguishes between Revelation and Scripture; the former is the unveiling of God; the latter contains this unveiling. Scripture is inspired because it is the literature of a theocratic people. It does not profess to make known the secrets of the universe, but simply moral and religious truths. Natural phenomena are spoken of not in scientific but in popular language. The old Kabbalistic idea made the Bible a repository of scientific learning which it is not. Revelation is not a book but God manifesting Himself in history in a supernatural manner, and yet this Revelation has the stamp of naturalness. It is in accordance with the laws

¹ It may be safely said that the Free Church of Scotland would not dismiss another Robertson Smith if they had another.

² See *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 19.

³ *Prophets of Israel*, 1, 4, 5, etc.

of God's general Revelation of Himself in nature and providence. It is not something proved by miracles and prophecy which are themselves Revelation, but God Himself is revealed, not as the unknown but as the known.¹

Perhaps the most prominent feature of present day theology is the effort to modify or form theological doctrines by the present position of science. Once the object was simply to meet objections, now it is to regard revelation as natural, so that it may not be in antagonism with any truth of nature. This is intimated in many places in *Lux Mundi*. The present generalisation is according to present facts, but new generalisations will be required by the discovery of new facts.² Again the Church may feel it can assimilate all new material and give place to all new knowledge.³ Darwinism is credited with the honour of having brought God back to His Creation. The Deistic idea had thrust Him far off. He was thought of only as transcendent, but now evolution 'in the guise of a foe did the work of a friend.' God is everywhere present in nature. Everything in nature is His work. There are no second causes. God is immanent in the Universe, and whatever happens is by His immediate agency.⁴ An argument for immortality is drawn from the law of continuity, and the unity of the visible and invisible in the co-relation of forces. Miracles are not violations of physical laws. Continuity teaches that God's laws do not require revision, and that matter is not vile. Co-relation speaks of something behind and beyond matter and so an invisible order which will remain when the present system of things has passed away.⁶

These suppositions intimate even when it is not expressed that the supernatural falls under the laws of the natural. To some this will appear as the denial of all miracles. Creation, for instance, was once held to be due to a divine fiat, a 'Let it be,' or an interference with the ordinary processes of natural law, but now it is regarded as evolved, and the world still in evolution, an unfinished world.⁷ The testimony of geology is

¹ See End of Revelation. ² p. 38. Canon Scott Holland.

³ Pref. Ibid. ix. ⁴ Ibid. 99. Aubrey Moore.

⁵ The Unseen Universe, Pref. viii, 1875, Tait and Balfour.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Professor Henry Drummond, Natural Law in the Spiritual World.

that the world is still in progress, and so with humanity, which as yet is only raw material which Christ will bring to perfection, not as fallen, but as simply imperfect. As God made worlds by causing them to make themselves, and to be perfected by glacier, rain and river, so Christ took the intractable material of humanity, and is working it into higher forms by the instrumentality of men. He founded a Church or Society.¹

This progress is illustrated or proved by means of the Darwinian position. Morality which does not exist in the earlier reaches of nature is found in development. It has the cosmos for its basis, and is manifested in higher evolution.² Even the regeneration of the spirit as taught by Jesus is found to have its parallel in the law of biogenesis. As there is no spontaneous generation of the natural life, so is there none of the spiritual. It is a special creation. As yet no passage has been found from the inorganic to the organic. From the law of continuity it might have been inferred *a priori* that there is such a passage though not yet found, but as a matter of fact in the present judgment of men most eminent for their knowledge of nature, here continuity has suffered interruption.

The Evolution of Religion was the subject of the Gifford lectures in 1890-91-92.³ The lecturer's avowed object was to separate between the premanent and the transient in religion. In the errors of past generations are found 'germinating truths.' Revelation is developed in nature and in history, having its culminating expression in the life of man as a spiritual being. The lecturer inclines to the 'Higher Pantheism,' or the immanency of God in nature which he finds in Christianity, while God is not limited to nature. Though immanent He is yet transcendent.

One book more may be mentioned as setting forth the present tendency on the part of men who consider themselves orthodox Christians, to explain Christianity in the light of the present development of Science.⁴ Here religion is found to be not only the basis of science, but its summit and crown. The idea of Scripture about a paradisaical state is abandoned

¹ Ibid. The Greatest Thing in the World

² The Ascent of Man.

³ By Edward Caird.

⁴ See the Scientific Basis of Faith, Joseph J. M. Murphy, 1873.

in its literal sense. It is without evidence in the history of nature. All the analogies are against the belief that death is a consequent of sin. It is rather the concomitant and condition of life. Nature constituted a basis for the highest moral and spiritual life of man.¹

Some of our scientific men have avowed themselves Atheists. The Universe they say is God, or there is no God. This may be called the lower Pantheism which limits God to the Universe and is really atheism. Man is God. The super-human Deity is fading away before us and is giving place to man, the maker of all gods.² But most scientific men who do not believe in revelation rest in what has been called Agnosticism or the position that we do not know enough either to believe or not to believe. The name owes its origin to Professor Huxley who was also its ablest exponent and advocate. We have no revelation either in nature or in Christianity. The problem of existence is insoluble. We are in a wild and tangled forest, where some think they have a gnosis. Others have no gnosis and are therefore Agnostics. They have a method of inquiry but no creed. Special revelation fails through the uncertainty of the gospel narratives and general revelation through the impossibility of knowing anything from nature. The principle of Agnosticism is not negative. It simply says that we should not affirm the certainty of the objective truth of any proposition unless we have logical evidence for its certainty.³ Huxley repudiated all connection with Comte or Positivism, refused to be called a materialist though he used materialistic terminology. Following Kant and Hume, he regarded mind and matter as the unknown hypothetical causes of states of consciousness.⁴

¹ See also a lecture on Evolution by John Clifford, D.D., a Baptist preacher. The work of Darwin is called good and genuine work. It influenced theology by showing that creation was not perfect, that it was subject to vanity. Nature was not yet at its best. Darwin and the Bible are agreed. Evolution may not be proved, but if it were, it is not inconsistent with a fair and just interpretation of the Bible.

² Professor Clifford, letter to Pollock and Review of the Unseen Universe in the *Fortnightly* 1875.

³ See *Nineteenth Century* 1889.

⁴ See Physical Basis of Life, see also the *Fortnightly* for 1876,

Herbert Spencer has essayed to find in Agnosticism as regards God and the Universe a ground for the reconciliation of religion and science. Human beliefs though they may appear entirely wrong have yet in them some small amount of truth.¹ Neither religion nor science may be wholly wrong or wholly right. An attitude of impartiality should therefore be maintained by the advocates of each. If the religious sentiment is not supernatural but must be classed among human emotions, we are bound, if only in the interests of philosophy, to inquire into its origin and function. The Universe may have come into existence by an act of creation or by a process of evolution. Both theories must be treated with respect. Science only brings us more into contact with the surrounding nescience. There is ever a something beyond our knowledge. In this nescience there is a sphere for the exercise of the religious sentiment. Though no religion may be actually true it may yet be the adumbration of truth. In the web running through the web of human history religion is everywhere present, and expresses some elemental fact. It must therefore be treated without prejudice as a subject of science. A basis must be found for complete reconciliation. The abstract truth in religion and the abstract truth in science must be that in which the two coalesce. No hypothesis concerning the origin of the Universe, Atheistic, Pantheistic, or Theistic is tenable. God, as Dean Mansel and Sir William Hamilton maintained, is past finding out, and if ever science and religion are to be reconciled it must be on the most certain of all facts that the power which the Universe manifests is to us utterly inscrutable.

Following Herbert Spencer on the constructive side we may place Balfour's 'Foundation of Belief.'² The object of the writer is to show that the presuppositions on which science rests are not so certain as they seem to be. The practical tendencies of the naturalistic theory are pronounced art. by Leslie Stephen, who says that the whole race is Agnostic. We have no metempirical knowledge, only experience, beyond that, all is mystery.

¹ First Principles, p. 304.

² 'The Foundation of Belief being Notes introductory to the Study of Theology,' by the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, 1895.

intolerable. It may be true, but its truth should not be admitted without a searching inquiry. Its positive teaching is the general body of the natural sciences, and its negative teaching that beyond these limits, nothing can be known. When a full and searching inquiry has been made into the foundation of scientific beliefs, it will be found that nothing stands more in need of demonstration than the obvious. For some persons evidence of the senses is the best of all evidence, as the proverb says, 'seeing is believing.' This is a somewhat crude view, and not to be accepted. If we take the central truth of Christianity—there is a God, and the fundamental presupposition of science—there is an independent material world, it is doubtful if as good a case could be made for accepting the second of these propositions as for accepting the first. We know as little about matter, if there be such a thing as matter, as we know what God is. We may not have proof but we may have consistent hypotheses. That God is not merely substance or subject, but a living God is a presupposition actually required by science. The naturalistic hypothesis introduces into every department of practice and speculation inextricable confusion by refusing to allow us to penetrate beyond the phenomenal causes, by which, in the order of nature, our beliefs are produced. If science itself is not an illusion we must postulate a rational God. As this must be done in the interests of science, so a moral God must be postulated in the interests of morality. The sum of the argument is that the great body of our beliefs, scientific, ethical, æsthetical, theological, form a more coherent and satisfactory whole in a theistic setting than in a naturalistic and still more satisfactory in a Christian setting. The writer shows, in conclusion, without entering the precincts of theology, the reasonableness of the doctrine of the Incarnation of Divinity in humanity.

Our task must here end. The century is now in its dotage. No more fresh thought is to be expected from it. Much of what has been recorded, is we may hope the memorial of what is past and gone, and that many of the Egyptians whom we have seen to-day, we shall see no more for ever. Whither in the century which comes, the lowing oxen will carry the ark of God, we must bide to see.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER I

BAMPTON LECTURES

A GENERAL view of the tendencies of the religious thought of the century might be gathered from the Bampton Lectures. The scope for subjects was large, ranging from the confirmation of Christianity to the confutation of all heresies and heretics.¹ The Lectures for 1801, by George Stanley Faber, have been already noticed. They were a defence of the Books of Moses against what was then called the attacks of infidelity, but which are now spoken of, as the results of criticism and the discoveries of geology.²

The lecturer of 1802 took up the great question of the day, the immense increase of the Methodists.³ Under this title were included all who were called evangelical preachers whether conforming or non-conforming. The arguments were taken from Bishop Lavington, and though not new, may be repeated as definitely marking the sentiments of the orthodox churchman of that time. The situation was alarming, for these enthusiasts were either already schismatics, or on the direct highway to schism. The chapels were crowded, the churches deserted and the authorised ministry with their commission disregarded. The successful preachers were either those who thought nothing of their orders or who had no orders to think of, but were ignorant and unlearned men.

All zeal which disregarded the Apostolic commission of the clergy or the divine institution of bishops, priests, and deacons,

¹ The Lectures began in 1780. Eight Divinity Lecture Sermons are preached every year in St Mary's, Oxford, by a lecturer chosen by the heads of colleges, according to the will of John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury.

² See under Faber.

³ 'Religious Enthusiasm Considered,' by George Frederick Nott.

was enthusiasm. This word came from the Gentile world and its meaning was bad. It really meant the possession of the mind by an evil spirit or demon. There was, however, another sense not quite so bad. There was a natural enthusiasm when people imagined that they were moved by a divine spirit. The cause of this delusion is often excessive vanity or an unsanctified ambition, aiming at spiritual pre-eminence. It is of the natural man, and therefore not good. This was thrust home to the Methodists, the enthusiasts of the present day, who not only like Korah and his company take upon them the priesthood, but even invented a new priesthood, 'after their own conceits.' They made a fold of their own and persuaded 'simple ones that salvation is to be found in what is created without authority. Guided by an excited imagination they have separated themselves from the Church.' This separation is schism, and schism, according to the Scriptures, is one of the worst of sins. The Church being divinely instituted has authority to admit to the Christian covenant, power to communicate grace by sacraments and to absolve penitents. It was not forgotten that many churchmen, even bishops, had denied that any such power was given to the Church. The answer was that this was denied by such bishops as Hoadly, and only by such bishops. The Church is a household and must have stewards to manage its affairs. The enthusiasts measured their religious progress by their raptures, their fervour, their feelings, but St Augustine said long ago 'Judgment is gone when the business comes to be a matter of feeling.' The first Methodists were pious young men, but they became enthusiasts, and their work 'has ended in a schism which has produced and may still continue to produce consequences which, had its authors foreseen, they would themselves have been the first to deplore.'

The lectures for 1803, were ordinary sermons with no special argument.¹ Those of 1804, entered into the long controverted question of the Calvinism of the Church of England². Richard Lawrence undertook to prove that the Predestinarian system of Calvin was totally inconsistent with the doctrine of our Articles, irreconcilable with our Liturgy and Homilies, and at variance with the private sentiments of our Reformers. All this the Lecturer said had often been proved, but he was to trace up the Articles to their genuine sources, and to determine their meaning

¹ John Farrer was lecturer. The subject was, The Mission and Character of Christ, and on the Beatitudes.

² Attempt to illustrate the articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly considered Calvinistic.

by ascertaining the precise objects, which their compilers had in view. The Articles are found to have followed Luther rather than Calvin, and the predestination of Art. XVII was that of a Church and not of individuals. The elect are the regenerate, and the regenerate are the baptised. The sum of the argument is that the Articles were written before Calvin's influence was felt, and therefore they were not Calvinistic.

The subject in 1805, was the Evidences of Christianity, The lecturer was Edward Nares.¹ Christianity had been assailed on every hand, and by every kind of argument, and had it not been of God, it must, long ago, have failed, either by inherent defect or by outward opposition. The Old and New Testaments constituted Revelation. The Mosaic Records were accurate history. The facts of geology were mere theories. Noah's flood was sufficient to account for all kinds of marine deposits; whether under the earth or on the tops of mountains. Christianity had been attacked by Celsus on the side of the Mosaic History, and unwisely defended by Origen, by means of allegorical interpretations. To give up the historical verity of the books of Moses is to give up Revelation, and what is left is the volume of nature where all is darkness. It may be satisfactory to the Deist, but it may also be interpreted as teaching nothing but pure atheism.

The next lecturer took a wider view of the scope of Revelation.² He approached if he did not enunciate the theory of the progressive education of the human race. His thesis was that 'there has been an infancy of the species, analogous to that of the individuals of whom it is composed, and that the infancy of human nature required a different mode of treatment from that which was suitable to its advanced state.' The doctrine was a kind of 'all for the best,' in which objections from irregularities in nature or the existence of evil were met by the consideration that God's plan was great, and that we see only a part of it. If we saw the whole, the things which now perplex us would be unveiled. It was assumed that there must have been an original revelation, to which man owed the faculties of reason and of speech, the knowledge of God and of duty. Such a revelation had the old Patriarchs. Something clearer was given to Abraham. God, so to speak, having failed to preserve the whole race from corruption, chose a nation. Revelation was progressive, given at sundry times and in divers manners. The Jews could not rise to the idea

¹ 'A View of the evidences of Christianity at the close of the Pretended Age of Reason.'

² John Browne, eight sermons, 1806.

of spiritual rewards, and so they had only or chiefly temporal promises. The world required a long preparation for the coming of Christ, who taught men more than Moses had done because men's capacities were greater. This theory of a progressive revelation was shown to meet many objections and to obviate many difficulties.

The lecturer of 1807,¹ discoursed of schism which he defined as separation from a sound part of Christ's Church established in any country. Hitherto separation had been regarded as an evil, but it was now coming to be looked on as a thing indifferent. Some excuse was made for the old Puritans. They did not regard separation as a light thing, but they laid the guilt on those who imposed what their consciences could not bear. The Methodists had no such plea. For them there was no excuse. They were worse than heretics, worse than infidels. Unfortunately they were not alone. Since the days of Bishop Hoadly even bishops have ceased to regard schism as a sin. This was unlike St Paul who tolerated no diversity either of doctrine or discipline, and unlike the Old Testament which had no toleration for the sin of Korah, nor the worship of the calves at Bethel and Dan.

The subject gave occasion for the discussion of subsidiary questions, as the doctrine of the innocency of error. The integrity, purity or sanctity of schismatics was no plea in extenuation of schism. Heretics always put on the appearance of greater sanctity than other people to give weight to their pretensions. It was so with the Montanists and the Manichæans. St John was the great enemy of comprehension and toleration. He said boldly that 'many deceivers had gone out into the world.' Jerome, too, was strong on the same side. He gave his testimony that every schism devised a heresy to justify its separation.

The subject was to be discussed on the principles of the Reformation. It was here that difficulties began. It had to be admitted that the Church itself had at one time become corrupt, and that heresies were embraced by those 'to whom were committed the oracles of God.' The divine commission and apostolical succession did not prevent the light within the Church becoming darkness. The flock of Christ was led astray by its own shepherds. The separation at the Reformation was caused by those who falsely call themselves Catholic. Some thought to justify separation from the Church of England on the same

¹ Thomas Le Mesurier, 'The nature and guilt of schism, with a particular reference to the principles of the Reformation.'

principle as separation from Rome, but the cases are not parallel. The Church of Rome imposes what is contrary to the true faith, not so the Church of England. It was lamented that at the very time when the old Dissenters were dying out, a new heresy had arisen. The followers of Wesley and Whitfield, 'guided by ignorance and fanaticism, the blind leading the blind,' teaching the doctrine of the 'horrible decree,' as Calvin himself called it, were driving compassion and charity from among the sons of men. The Methodists had not formally separated from the Church, but they were doing something still more wicked. They were following Archdeacon Blackburne, and taking advantage of the liberty advocated by him, 'swallowing up all the other Dissenters as well as destroying the Church.'

In 1808 the Lectures were a continuation of the subject treated of by Joseph White in 1784.¹ White had contrasted Christianity with the religion of Mohammed, and had argued against Gibbon and other writers who had traced the origin and progress of Christianity to human means, that it was not therefore human. The lecturer for this year supplemented the argument by various considerations, as that God never uses extraordinary means for what can be accomplished by ordinary. He works no unnecessary miracles. Christianity, though suited to the wants and hopes of men has no marks of the expedients of human policy. In moral legislature and in religious wisdom it is in advance of all previous religions and philosophies. Its Author therefore could not have been an enthusiast, while His wisdom and goodness forbid us to believe that He was a deceiver.

Stanley Faber's argument for the truth of the Mosaic history was taken up by the Lecturer of 1809 who added confirmation from Eastern Religions². From a passage in Megasthenes it was inferred that the Hindus made no pretension to such a chronology as they now claim. It was limited to 6000 years before Alexander. They believe in a chaos before creation, that the universe was in a profound sleep, and that creation issued from a fiat of the Self Existent. In their cosmology there is a gradation in the order in which things were created. There were six periods, ending with the creation of man. They have also a tradition of

¹ John Penrose, *The Truth of Christianity from the Wisdom displayed in its Original Establishment, and the History of False and Corrupted Systems of Religion.*

² John Barley Somers Carwithin, *'A View of the Brahminical Religion in its Confirmation of the Truth of the Sacred History, and in its influence on the Moral Character.'*

the flood. The argument was reckoned so conclusive that it was ascribed to 'a gracious Providence that oriental literature had borne testimony to the truth of Christianity when unbelievers were boasting that it would not see the end of another century.'

In 1792 Edward Evanson, an eccentric clergyman who became a Unitarian wrote a book called 'The Dissonance of the Four Generally Received Evangelists.' It was devoid of any true spirit of criticism, and might have been allowed to drop into oblivion. The thesis was that the Gospels being so full of contradictions they were not worthy of credit. The Christian faith stood not in the wisdom of men, that is in the foolishness of those who bear witness to the genuineness of the Gospels. It stands in the power of God and in the spirit of prophecy. The only consistent Gospel was St Luke's which had not originally the miraculous stories about the birth of Christ, but had its beginning with the record of what Jesus 'began to do and to teach.' The evidence from prophecy was in the apostasy of the last days which took place when what is called orthodox Christianity was established in the time of Constantine. The refutation of this book was the object of the lecturer in 1810.¹ He defended the miracles, regarding their value as evidences to be as good if not better than that of prophecy. He defended the canonical gospels, and wrote dissertations on collateral subjects as the apocryphal gospels and the prevalence of the Greek language in the time of the apostles.

The Lectures for 1811 combined the defence of Christianity with the confutation of the Methodists.² The excellency of Christian morality was contrasted with the defective morality of the Pagans. The doctrine of evolution was refuted, or at least the doctrine of those who maintained spontaneous generation, and from this inferred that there was no need of a Creator or of any power above nature. The world everywhere has marks of design, wisdom and goodness. Revelation had for its chief object, moral and religious rather than any other kind of truth, yet the historical record of Genesis is correct. The old objection about light before the sun is obviated by the consideration that the sun is not a body of fire and so not the direct source of light. Noah's flood is sufficient to account for the abnormal condition of the strata of the earth.

Once more the Bampton lecturer raises the war-cry against

¹ Thomas Falconer.

² John Bidlake, 'The Truth and Consistency of Divine Revelation with some Remarks on the contrary extremes of Infidelity and Enthusiasm.'

the Methodists, but this time in the attitude of defence.¹ The clergy had been described as 'heathenish priests and mitred infidels.' The Methodists and Evangelicals used to speak of their preaching the Gospel for the first time in parishes where the clergy were exemplary and the congregations devout. This discussion involved the usual questions of faith and works, the operations of the Spirit ordinary and extraordinary, and whether or not baptised persons were also converted. Whitfield is quoted as denying that good works are necessary to justification and as calling them 'blind guides,' who taught salvation by works. Romaine had edited a book² in which all were condemned who say 'that obedience to Jesus Christ is the condition of salvation.' Dr Hawker after the same fashion makes all duties and obligations unnecessary. In opposition to this, the lecturer said that he held with Cranmer and our Reformers, that there were two justifications. One was now by faith, but there was another, called final, which was by the fruit of faith and inseparable from it. The Evangelical clergy made justification a state from which it was impossible to fall, but the orthodox doctrine was that all are justified by baptism and thereby brought not into salvation which is the final justification by works, but into a state of salvation. Whitfield had spoken of the Spirit being 'poured out on assemblies,' and as filling and overflowing our souls, and this language was endorsed by Wesley, as being confirmed by the experience of the children of God.

There was a clause in Bampton's will which allowed the lecturer to take as his subject the refutation of 'heretics and schismatics upon the authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church.' This was the subject in 1813.³ Their authority is that of witnesses. They testify what was the doctrine and discipline in their time. Augustine warned the people against excessive reliance on the Fathers, as their works had no canonical authority, nor was their teaching unexceptionable. They fell into many errors, and they were not at one in many things yet, as Daillé said, they were 'a subordinate defence and protection of divine truth.' The Church of Rome claimed them as on its side.

¹ Richard Mant, afterwards Bishop of Down and Connor, 'An Appeal to the Gospel, or an Inquiry into the Justice of the Charge alleged by the Methodists and other objectors that the Gospel is not preached by the National Clergy.'

² Mason's Spiritual Treasury.

³ John Collinson, 'A Key to the Writings of the Principal Fathers of the Christian Church who flourished during the first three centuries.'

The Reformers went direct to Scripture, but they maintained also that on the points in dispute they had the authority of the Fathers. Their 'Apologies' show that they were rational men. The Church of Rome has added to their doctrines, and the Dissenters have departed from them. In rejecting the three orders of the ministry they reject the Church.¹

In 1815 the subject was the Holy Ghost the Comforter.² That the Holy Ghost was a person is shown from the words of Jesus, 'I will send you another Comforter,' not merely consolation but a Consoler. Though the Fathers are of little value as interpreters of Scripture, yet their testimony is valuable, and they always speak of the Holy Ghost as a person. Even the Arians disowned the Macedonians because they denied this personality. The promise was not limited to the Apostolic age, nor fulfilled in the gift of miracles to the early Church. It was a gift to all generations. Some make the fulfilment of this promise in the grace and comfort of sacraments, but the promise was of sending more grace or comfort. The Comforter was to guide into all truth. The sacraments are significant ceremonies, but they are not even peculiar or distinctive marks of Christianity, for they were not unknown to the Jews. Nor is the promise fulfilled in the ordinary operations of the Spirit, which merely cast light on what is already revealed. Illumination is not revelation. Jews and Pagans as well as Christians have had the Spirit in this sense. The comfort which the Paraclete gave to the afflicted disciples was the discovery of a new and better covenant, the revelation of peace and pardon. The fulfilment of the promise of the Comforter to the Church was the possession of the inspired Scriptures.

The Lectures of 1816 were on the unity of the Church.³ Christ established a society, He appointed officers. Those who separate from the succession of these officers separate from the Church. The constitution of this society was unchallenged till the Reformation, and even now remains in the greater part of the Christian world. The lectures are full of arguments aimed at non-episcopal Churches. All efforts at Unity were shown to have failed because they did not proceed on the principles of the Church which has the Apostolic constitution.

¹ For 1814 see under Van Mildert.

² Reginald Heber, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta, 'The Personality and Office of the Comforter.'

³ John Hume Spry, 'Christian Unity.'

The lectures for 1817 were on the Bible.¹ With this book and conscience we are alone. External evidence requires ability and learning, and is therefore not for the multitude. The evidence on which men practically rely is the inward attestation of the heart to the truths of Scripture. Revelation is progressive. The substantial doctrine of both the Old and New is redemption by a Mediator.

The programme was varied in 1818 by a refutation of the Unitarians.² The Trinity, the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and the never ending punishment of the lost were defended by the usual arguments. Unitarianism was said to be progressing through 'the impunity lately granted by the legislature,' but it overturns the foundations of the Christian faith. It is 'a system of unbelief which captivates only vain persons.'

In 1819 the lecturer combated Unitarians, Nonconformists, Calvinists and Romanists,³ but was unusually merciful to the Methodists.

In 1820, the subject was the divine origin of Episcopacy,⁴ and next year it was the Evidences of Revelation.⁵ The argument was that God must have revealed Himself and there was no proof to the contrary. Of all professed revelations, the Christian is the only one which bears the likelihood of being true.⁶

Charles Goddard D.D. in 1823, made an elaborate defence of reason or the understanding as the foundation of faith. If one Bampton lecturer may be supposed to be replying to another, Goddard may be taken as answering John Miller.⁷ The lectures might be called a defence of the old orthodoxy, on the principle that Christianity is grounded on argument as opposed to those who believe because they were so taught, or because they feel that what they believe is true. Evangelicals or Methodists are not named, but they were evidently in the lecturer's mind. The

¹ John Miller, 'The Divine Authority of Holy Scripture asserted from its adaptation to the real state of human nature.'

² Dr C. A. Moysey, 'The Doctrine of Unitarians examined as opposed to the Church of England.'

³ Hector Davies Morgan, 'A Comparative view of the Religious Practices of the age, or a trial of the chief spirits that are in the world by the standard of the Scriptures.'

⁴ George Fausset, 'The Claims of the Established Church to Exclusive Attachment and Support, and the Dangers which menace her from Heresy and Schism.'

⁵ John Jones, 'The Moral Tendency of Divine Revelation, Asserted and Illustrated.'

⁶ For 1822 see under Richard Whately.

⁷ 'The mental conditions necessary to a due Inquiry into Religious Evidences, Stated and Exemplified.'

influences which interfere with the operation of the understanding are from the fancy or the will. This is seen in the Church of Rome, but still more in fanaticism which is more mischievous in that it pretends to immediate or particular revelations, and makes will or sentiment the arbiter of truth. Such expressions as 'taught of God,' are referred to being taught by the ordinary means, and 'If any man will do the will of Him that sent me, he shall know of the doctrine' is explained that he who has brought his mind into that moral state in which alone it should approach religious inquiry, will discover that the Christian doctrine is of God. To the common objection that a mere belief of the understanding or proof by reason may be only a dead faith, the answer is that where there is a proper conviction, it is never inoperative or ineffectual, as the understanding gives the impulse to the will or affections. The reason, moreover, is not entirely left to itself, for the Holy Spirit superintends the process and 'converts belief upon probable grounds into certainty.'

J. J. Conybeare was lecturer in 1824.¹ From the example of some of the New Testament writers, he argued that there must be a secondary or mystical sense in some parts of Scripture. He traced its history and its various forms from Philo and the Alexandrian Jews, the Fathers and the Schoolmen down to the Reformers, most of whom like Calvin, substituted accommodation for a secondary sense. Though the lecturer advocated a mystical sense, he yet found that there had been error on the side of excess rather than of deficiency. The secondary sense, interpretation, had been very extravagant. Origen is specially set forth as an example. He laid himself open to the just rebukes of his adversary Celsus in founding arguments on the allegorical meaning.

The progressive character of revelation which had been the subject in 1806 was taken up by George Chandler in 1825.² The argument was orthodox, if not original or profound. There was first, as we read in the Old Testament, a revelation to all men, then a further revelation to the Jews while the other nations lapsed into idolatry. Jesus revealed things either not known or only obscurely known by the Jews. Such were the doctrines of God as three persons, a future life, and the moral duties of man on earth. He gave prominence to the unobtrusive virtues as

¹ 'An attempt to trace the history and to ascertain the limits of the secondary and spiritual interpretation of Scripture.'

² 'The Scheme of Divine Revelation, considered principally in its connection with the Progress and Improvement of Human Society.'

purity, charity, humility. The lectures might be called a doctrinal history of the Church from Adam to the present time.

The Lectures of William Vaux in 1826 were on the two Sacraments.¹ The benefits are remission of sin and deliverance from the effects of hereditary corruption, but these benefits are only for those who really believe and repent. There is not any physical union between the grace and the sign. The actual transmission is the work of God Himself. In the Sacraments we have the assurance that the benefits to which they relate will be undoubtedly conveyed to us. After saying some very strong things about the efficacy of Sacraments, he came to the conclusion that after all the grace is the same as that which accompanies any ordinance of religion rightly observed.²

Thomas Horne in 1828³ defended the Church of England against the Church of Rome, and addressed an argument to non-Episcopal churches on the necessity of Episcopacy.

Edward Burton in 1829 discoursed on heresy.⁴

The Greek sects or schools were called heretics, as the philosophers of the Academy or the followers of Epicurus. So among the Jews, the Hellenists applied the same term to the leading sects as the sect of the Sadducees, the Pharisees, the Essenes and, subsequently, of the Nazarenes. Bardesanes, himself a Christian, spoke of the heresy of the Christians. It is now used only in a bad sense, and has come to mean those who do not receive the entire doctrine of the Church, that is, the Christians who are not orthodox. The Fathers applied it only to the Gnostics, whom they denied to be Christians, and this is the reference in every passage of the New Testament where heresy is condemned. The argument, so far as any argument can be traced amid the heaps of quotations, is against the Unitarians who claim to agree with the Ebionites, but as they were a Gnostic sect they did not believe that Christ was merely man. Unitarians proper have no predecessors in the early ages of Christianity.

The agreement of the early Saxon Church with the Reformed Church of England was the subject in 1830.⁵ The lecturer argued that, in many points, our forefathers rejected the doctrines in

¹ 'The Benefits annexed to a participation in the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.'

² For 1827 see under Milman.

³ 'The Religious Necessity for the Reformation asserted and the extent to which it was carried in the Church of England vindicated.'

⁴ 'An Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age.'

⁵ Henry Soames, 'Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Anglo-Saxon Church.'

which the Church of Rome differed from the Church of England. Tradition meant originally what was handed down in the Bible or interpretations of the Bible that had been commonly received. The Council of Trent gave a new meaning to traditions, making them something apart from the Scriptures and of equal value, the unwritten or oral having the same validity as the written. The Anglo-Saxon Church maintained the sufficiency of Scripture. The apocryphal books were not admitted to be canonical, though they were read and used for popular instruction. In the Anglo-Saxon Church there were many superstitions, some of which are the same as those of the Church of Rome, and some different. Children, for instance, after baptism were confirmed with chrism if the bishop were present, if not they were confirmed by the presbyters without chrism. The eucharist was also administered in the belief that the children being now regenerated might be nourished in the new spiritual life. Bede interprets the words of Jesus to Peter to mean that he was only the figure of the Rock on which the Church was built; the Rock was Christ. Absolution was not of any avail unless there was true penitence. Paul had a pre-eminence over Peter. The bark of Peter was the Church of the circumcision, but Paul had the Gentile world. James the Just was the successor of Christ in the universal episcopate. The decision of the Second Council of Nicæa for the use of images in worship was rejected. There were many superstitious legends about Mary, and extravagant prayers addressed to her, yet there are traces of opposition to this Mary worship. The use of images seems to have been sanctioned before the Norman Conquest, and even Alfred the Great is found to omit the second command entirely from the Decalogue, and to make up the number by adding a tenth 'Thou shalt not make golden or silver gods.' Transubstantiation is not taught, and Purgatory was only a doctrine of passing through fire. Those who could do this were saved. The authorities are Ælfric, Bede, Alcuin, and some Saxon homilies.

The lecturer for 1831 took the subject of evidences.¹ That learning is necessary to conviction, and that the unlearned must rely on the learned is the position which the lecturer undertakes to refute. Neither learning nor deference to learning is necessary for faith, but a desire to do the will of God. Certain dispositions or conditions are necessary, one of these being instruction in

¹ 'The popular Evidence of Christianity, Stated and Defended by Thomas William Lancaster.'

Christian doctrine through a lawful ministry. The Canon of the New Testament should be received on the authority of those who settled it long ago. They had good evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the books, though we do not know what that evidence was. To have to settle it now is to come to the 'obnoxious principle of argument.' Learned men like Jeremiah Jones in his 'History of the Canon of the New Testament' have made more difficulties than they have solved. If the books are genuine so also are the miracles attested in the books. The primary evidence however is inherent. The soul of man is gifted with an intuitive power of discriminating objects mental as well as physical. The Gospel is preached to all men, and all men have the faculty of perceiving its truth. The most 'simple and unlearned have attained that full assurance of faith which no subtlety could confound nor persecution subdue.'¹

The lecturer for 1833, Dr Frederick Nolan, said that he entered 'a field at once new and extensive.' He was to meet the difficulties which had been raised by recent scientific discoveries in relation to Revelation, this last word being taken as synonymous with the Bible. The natural philosopher neglects the great first cause or the mind which gives existence to the universe, confines himself to secondary causes or the qualities of passive matter.² Revelation has suffered from opposing science, but the writers of the Bible do not speak with philosophical precision. They accommodated themselves to the obvious outward appearance, and spoke so as to be understood by those to whom their writings were first addressed. The Mosaic account of the creation and the Noachic deluge are a part of what God has revealed. In the Bible record there were six days of creation, which is a mean between the instantaneous and the progressive. Ordinary causes were controlled and quickened by an Almighty Intelligence. It is the same in the account of the deluge and feeding the Israelites in the wilderness.

That Moses was not guided by the prevailing philosophy of the East as to the soul of the world, is a proof that he was under the guidance of divine teaching. He taught a Creator as distinct from the created, and professing immediate inspiration his philosophy can stand the strictest scrutiny in the face of modern science. It is not necessary to suppose him acquainted with more than the ordinary appearances of nature, but he must have

¹ For 1832 see under Hampden.

² 'The Analogy of Revelation and Science Established.'

been sufficiently versed in the principles of science to have accommodated his descriptions to the views entertained of it by the moderns. He knew the true system of the universe, which he may have learned among the Egyptians, from whom Pythagoras derived his doctrine that the sun was the centre of the universe. In writing his account of creation, though he knew the true system, he wrote in accordance with the object he had in view, which was not to teach astronomy or geology but religion.

In this way astronomy and geology confirm the truth of the Mosaic record that the world was made in six literal days, and that it was destroyed by a deluge in the days of Noah. Before the flood there was no succession of seasons but only a perennial spring. The sky was ever serene, undisturbed by clouds or rain, and the earth watered with dew. The fall of man was the result of eating a fruit which may have changed the humours of the blood, and awakened the 'concupiscible and irascible affections' of which human nature, for the first time, became sensible.¹

In 1836, Charles A. Ogilvie lectured on the 'Divine glory manifested in the conduct and discourses of our Lord.' Next year Thomas Stuart Lyle Vogan was lecturer.² He went over the beaten ground of the Trinitarian Controversy. If there was a gleam of originality, it was in the discovery that the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian creed are not 'damnatory' but 'monitory,' condemning no one but charitably setting forth the necessity of keeping the 'Catholic Faith.'

The lecturer for 1838³ was a champion of what is now reckoned the 'Anglican' position as against the Romanist and the Sectarian. The authentic teaching of the Church is shown to be in conformity with Scripture Analogy and the Moral Constitution of Man. The doctrine and discipline of the Church of England were Apostolic. The Scriptures read without a bias or guide led to Socinianism. This was demonstrated in the case of the foreign Protestants, and to the objection that other non-episcopal Churches were not Socinian, there was the answer that they only required time. All sects reject what does not suit them. As John Henry Newman had just demonstrated, it was only the 'Catholic' Church of England which accepts the whole Bible. Our Reformers it is

¹ The revenues of the Bampton Lectures for the years 1834 and 1835, were devoted to repairs of the estate.

² 'The principal objections against the doctrine of the Trinity and a portion of the evidence on which that doctrine is received by the Catholic Church reviewed.'

³ H. A. Woodgate.

true appreciated the Bible and said very little about Church authority, because their circumstances did not require it. The office of the Church is to teach, and of the Scriptures to prove. There was a difference between the giving of the law and the gospel. The first was written on tables of stone, the last was communicated directly to men. The law was written, the gospel was taught. The first Christians had teachers, but no written books. These came after and were the result of circumstances. The Church though authorised to teach is not infallible. The Church of Rome has left the Scriptures to follow its own devices, while the Sectarians answer the description of the Apostle, 'presumptuous, self-willed, speaking evil of the things they understood not'—men that have 'crept in unawares of old ordained to this condemnation, the offspring of the Latitudinarianism of the last century which was generated by Puritanism and Profligacy.'

The course of events at Oxford gave occasion for a fuller examination of the question of tradition and its relative importance alongside of the authority of Scripture. The Council of Trent declared unwritten tradition to have authority independent of Scripture, and John Keble had just published a sermon in which he spoke of a 'tradition independent of the written Word, parallel to Scripture and not derived from it.' Keble did not admit the inference that this interfered with the authority of Scripture as the rule of faith, but there were others who could not see the difference between this view of tradition and that of the Council of Trent.

This tradition was the subject of W. D. Conybeare's Lectures in 1839.¹ The Ante-Nicene period was regarded by the Traditionalists as the halcyon days of the Church. Conybeare everywhere shows a profound reverence for the Fathers and a just estimate of their value as witnesses of what was the received doctrine of their time. He wished to take a middle course between those who despised the voice of antiquity and those who made it of equal authority with the Scriptures. The Fathers generally taught the leading doctrines of Christianity as now received, but they taught many doctrines now rejected, and as interpreters of Scripture or as authorities independent of Scripture they are worthless. Irenæus though laying down the principle that the Apostles had been

¹ 'An analytical Examination into the character, value and just application of the writings of the Christian Fathers during the Ante-Nicene period.'

directed by God to commit to writing what hitherto had been oral teaching, yet adopts from tradition the absurd legends of the forged gospels. The Scriptures contain the whole body of Christian doctrine and neither require nor admit any extraneous addition. St Chrysostom said, 'Look not for any other oracles, you have the oracles of God; no one can teach like them, therefore I exhort you to provide for yourselves *Bibles*.' The little reliance to be placed on the Fathers is seen by an examination of their genuine writings after we have passed over the multitude of forgeries which tradition has handed down in their name. Justin Martyr, one of the most rational of them, even in an argument with a Jew puts absurd meanings on the Old Testament prophecies. 'Binding his foal unto the vine and his ass's colt unto the choice vine,' is Christ entering Jerusalem. 'The government shall be upon his shoulders,' is Jesus on the Cross. The nineteenth psalm is an exact prophecy of the progress of the missionaries sent to announce the manifestation of the Sun of righteousness. He also sanctions the theories of the Millenarians and the absurd doctrine of demonology according to which the progeny of the 'Sons of God' and the 'daughters of men,' were the gods of the Gentile world.

Irenæus is not much wiser, though sometimes he gives counsel against the very fancies which he adopted. He found the number 666 by adding to the age of Noah at the flood the height and the breadth of Nebuchadnezzar's image. He found salvation in Mary's obedience, as the fall of man was in the disobedience of Eve. But these are nothing to the extravagances of Origen and the Alexandrian Fathers. The lecturer's respect for the early Fathers did not allow him to dwell on their absurdities nor even always to quote them. He disputes the validity of the Canon of Lirinensis that amid conflicting diversities we are to regard, 'the Catholic Church as a rule to a line and as the clue to conduct us in the labyrinths of opinion.' Lirinensis himself goes on to say that as early as the reign of Constantine the Arian heresy had introduced corruption, infected the whole Christian world and almost all the bishops of the Latin Church, and that their only safeguard was to prefer the ancient faith before the recently introduced corruption. But how could that ancient faith be correctly ascertained? If the appeal had been made from those Arian bishops to their predecessors they might have answered that they and their predecessors were in the same condition as witnesses of the apostolic tradition. So the appeal must go back till it reached the original apostolic docu-

ments which were received by both parties, that is the Bible itself.¹

James Garbett in 1842 chose his subject with special reference to the Tractarian position.² His argument was that Romanism and its probably unconscious imitation in the new Oxford movement interfered with the offices of Christ which the lecturer understood literally, and in the most orthodox Protestant or Evangelical sense. He received Episcopacy as of divine origin, and necessary to the well-being though not to the being of a Church. For this he could quote a Catholic consensus of Anglican divines, including not merely moderate men like Jewell and Hooker, but the class represented by Laud and Bramhall. The Christian ministry is not a priesthood. Zwingle's doctrine of the Eucharist is not the mere commemoration which it is generally reported to have been, though that was the aspect it took in the controversy with the Romanists and Lutherans. Calvin mediated between Luther and Zwingle, teaching the real spiritual presence which is the doctrine of the Church of England. The authority of Hooker is adduced for the substantial agreement of all the Reformed Churches on this subject. The Tractarians receive ample credit for the restitution of many things, especially concerning the order and vocation of the Church and the commission of the clergy, but they are Romanising in their tendency, and view everything from a Roman standpoint. Their system is formed after the model of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries when there were 'unquestionable signs of fast-coming apostasy.'

Anthony Grant was lecturer in 1843.³ The argument was to the effect that missions should be carried on by the Church as a body, not by individuals or societies apart from the authority of the Church, and not by books, that is Bibles, but by living preachers. He was followed in 1844 by Richard William Jelf D.D.⁴ who discoursed of the grace of the two Sacraments, and how that kind of grace differs from the grace of Sacramentals.

'On Justification' was the title of the Lectures for 1845 by Charles A. Heurtley who admitted justification by faith and imputed righteousness, and at the same time, justification by baptism. The

¹ For 1840 See under Hawkins. Bishop Wilberforce was to have lectured in 1841, but was prevented by a sad bereavement.

² 'Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, being a Vindication of the Church of England from Theological Novelties.'

³ The Past and Present Extension of the Gospel by Missions to the Heathen.

⁴ An Inquiry into the Means of Grace, their Mutual Connection and combined Use with Essential Reference to the Church of England.'

labour of the lecturer was to reconcile two distinct principles taken eclectically from the two distinct systems of theology.

In 1846 the lecturer was Augustus V. Short.¹ He believed that there was a Holy Ghost still abiding in the Church, enlightening the intellect, and witnessing by the renewed life to the sonship of believers. He advocated the divine authority of the Church and its ministry, while maintaining that all true Christians were really 'taught of God.' In the course of his lectures he had opportunities of thrusting at the old heretics, at Calvin for taking the witness of the Spirit as evidence of the truth of Scripture, instead of the testimony and tradition of the Church; at the fanaticism of the Puritans during the 'Great Rebellion,' and the enthusiasm of the Methodists, who, like the old Montanists and Donatists professed to have immediate inspirations of the Spirit, and separated themselves from the order of the Church.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man, Walter Augustus Shirley, was lecturer in 1847. He died after the delivery of two lectures which were published with another two found in MS. nearly complete.² He controverted all theories of tradition either as authoritative 'unwritten Word,' or as infallible interpretations of Scripture. The Canon of Lirinensis is limited to a negative application. It serves to show that doctrines which we can prove to be of recent introduction are not divine. In this way the apocryphal books have been rejected because they were never universally received. The Church of England allows authority as to 'traditions and ceremonies' so that they may be different at different times and in different countries. In the first Homily what are called 'apostolical traditions' or 'doctrines apostolical' as distinguished from Scriptural, are in the strongest language condemned. There was tradition from the Creation to the flood, and from the flood to the Exodus, but Scripture itself tells us how insecure was its keeping and what need there was for a written document to preserve men from error and darkness. Clement writing to the Corinthians, and Polycarp to the Philadelphians, speaking of St Paul's doctrine 'taught in all Churches,' do not go to tradition for that doctrine, but to their possession of the original letters. The creeds cannot be received as depositories of apostolic tradition, for they were written long after the Apostles' time. Epiphanius always spoke of Scripture as the

¹ 'The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit, illustrated from the eighth chapter of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, etc.'

² 'The Sufficiency of Scripture.'

source of truth, and tradition, when applied to doctrine, means what is handed down in the Scripture.

The Lectures of 1848 by Edward Garrard Marsh were pious and orthodox discourses on the fall of man and the means of restoration.¹ In 1849 R. Michell took the subject of evidences.² There can, he said, be no demonstration of the truth of religion in the strict mathematical sense of demonstration, yet without this there may be certainty. The evidence of Christianity is a growing evidence, in other words, Christianity keeps pace with the progress of man. The use of reason is defended, and with it, the reasonableness of Christianity. Man has impulses and powers of good, or a testimony within which is strengthened by the external testimony in the written Word. The external and internal evidences of Christianity 'must be associated, cemented, and welded together, so to speak, in order to form the defences of Revelation.' The internal are called '*a priori*,' as being in the mind, the external '*a posteriori*,' as appealing to the outward sense, such as prophecy, miracles. To these is added the evidence of the Spirit, illuminating and sanctifying the hearts of believers.

In 1850 Edward Meyrick Goulburn discoursed on the Resurrection.³ Popular theology inclined too much to Spiritualism and neglected the importance of the body. Resurrection is not a miraculous re-animation, but a development into a superior life. It is not the same as creation, not a new formation, but an operation on the previously subsisting rudiments of an old nature. That which shall be raised in incorruption is not the present organisation, but that which constitutes the essential basis of the body. Every component particle may be dissipated far and wide, yet there remains something which has the germ of existence. It is this which shall be raised, and however great may be the change in form, it will be the same body.

In 1851.⁴ Joseph Esmond Riddle, lectured on 'The Natural History of Infidelity and Superstition, as contrasted with Christian Faith.' Infidelity led to superstition and superstition to infidelity.

William Thomson, afterwards Archbishop of York, made his subject in 1853, 'The Atonement.' He laid the foundation of his argument in our idea of God, our sense of sin, and our longing for reconciliation. Man was conscious of an unworthi-

¹ 'The Christian Doctrine of Sanctification.'

² Christian Evidence considered generally.'

³ 'The Resurrection of the Body Taught in Holy Scripture.'

⁴ For 1852 see under Wilson.

ness which made a gulf that could not be bridged over. Some men carried the crude principles of human justice into the divine economy, arguing that each criminal must stand alone, but the voice of humanity as well as the Mosaic ritual proclaims the necessity of atonement. It may be hard to reconcile the attributes of Justice and Love, but they are not contradictory. There is, what is called, an antimony in reason, that is two propositions that appear to be contradictory, but can both separately be shown to be true. The explanations of the mode of the atonement are various. The early or patristic idea, though not sanctioned by all the Fathers, was, that a ransom was paid to Satan, and so men were bought back. Another explanation was that of satisfaction to justice, or paying the debt which all men had incurred. This theory had its chief advocate in Anselm. He did not, however, like later theologians, make Christ bear the punishment of sin. Christ satisfied justice by His obedience rather than by His suffering. The lecturer, regarding the subject as not within the compass of man's reason, does not accept any of these explanations. He is satisfied with the fact of the atonement, and he is orthodox enough to believe not only that man was reconciled to God by the atonement, but also that God was reconciled to man.

Samuel Waldegrave, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, in 1854, refuted the Pre-Millennarians, or those who believe that Christ will come before the Millennium to reign in person on the earth.¹

In 1855, John Ernest Bode,² in a tolerant and anti-dogmatic spirit opposed the narrowness of scholastic definitions, and vindicated the freedom of the Church of England, which leaves us with the indefiniteness of Scripture on subjects which it is possible for us to know only in part. He disapproved of the conduct of the Bishop of Exeter, in trying to narrow the Church of England as to the question of baptismal regeneration, which had been left open ever since the Reformation. He disapproved also of the proceedings against Archdeacon Denison, not, however, admitting that the question at issue was not decided by Art. XXIX, but because he saw in these proceedings the spirit of exclusiveness. The absence of precision did not limit the sphere of belief, but rather enlarged it. It is dangerous in our time to have precise views on the manner of Christ's presence or the

¹ 'New Testament, Millenarianism or the Kingdom and Coming of Christ, as taught by Himself and His Apostles.'

² 'The absence of Precision in the Formularies of the Church of England, scriptural, and suitable to a state of probation.'

effect of sacraments, the meaning of apostolic succession, and many other similar subjects, where precision of view could not really be had. This is the condition of our present lot which we cannot evade, and which it is neither pious nor prudent to ignore. The Church of England does not control the individual study of the Scriptures. One of the 'Homilies' says plainly, 'The humble man may search any truth boldly in the Scriptures without any danger of error.' With our Bibles in our hands 'we neither fear development nor tradition.' The freedom and openness of the Church are seen in requiring no subscription from the laity. The damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed are limited to those who obstinately deny the substance of the Christian faith, and do not apply to those who merely reject the explanation of the Trinity.

The lecturer's position may be seen from a sermon devoted to the subject of regeneration. He does not admit that the word is applied by the Church exclusively to any one act, and he accepts the challenge of Bishop Mant, who in his Bampton Lectures defied any one to show from Scripture or Church formularies that regeneration is ever mentioned except as the new birth, and, that once regenerated, there is no mention after this of being born again. The Homily for Whit Sunday, without any mention of baptism, declares the work of the Holy Ghost to be 'the regeneration and sanctification of mankind,' and those to whom the Homily is addressed, though baptised Christians, are to pray to be 'regenerate and newly born again in all goodness and righteousness, sobriety and truth.' An infant may be born again *to* all these things but that is a new birth *unto* righteousness, while this in the Homily is to be born again *in* all these virtues. It is the actual accomplishment of that spiritual work of which baptism is a means, pledge, or token, so that the Church has not been precise in the use of the term regeneration. It is sometimes equivalent to conversion. A birth of God, a begetting by the gospel, a begetting with the word of truth, a being born not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible by the word of the living God, are expressions of St John, St Paul, St James and St Peter. They are all used without any apparent reference to baptism, and imply a conscious reception of the gospel. To apply to every baptised person the words of St John 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin,' would be palpably absurd. Hammond has written 'He that lives an impious and uncharitable life *is no regenerate child of God,*' and Origen before him to the same effect, 'So far as we commit sin, we have not yet put off the

devil's generation.' A 'birth of God' is a complete renovation, an entire conversion. But St Paul's rhetoric confounds the dogmatism both of those who maintain and those who deny baptismal regeneration. To the Galatians who were 'all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,' who had been 'baptised into Christ,' had 'put on Christ,' and had received the spirit of adoption he has still to say, 'Little children of whom I travail in birth till Christ be formed in you.' Jeremy Taylor, Beveridge and Sherlock use the term regeneration for the general influence of the Holy Ghost upon man's spirit, and Cranmer even speaks of our being regenerated in the Holy Communion. Hammond and Sherlock distinguished between the regenerate and the unregenerate among baptised persons. The same absence of precision is found in the teaching of the Church of England in many other matters, as in the reserve shown with regard to reprobation while teaching predestination, and on the question of Church order; while it is maintained as an historical fact that there have always been three orders of ministers in the Church, it does not insist on any explicit doctrine of apostolic succession.

The eight Lectures of Edward Arthur Litton in 1856 on 'The Mosaic Dispensation,'¹ showed the truth of the Mosaic religion from the uses which it served when it was imposed, and its prophetic character as preparatory to the gospel dispensation.

William Edmund Jelf in 1857 seems to have had in his mind the arguments of his predecessor in 1855.² He was to show that Christian faith comprehends most if not all of the various opinions which have divided Christendom. Each is an element of the whole truth, and contributes to the full measure of faith. Doctrines are not to be rejected because to our finite conception there is or appears to be an actual contradiction, such as between predestination and free will, trinity and unity. Still less are any doctrines to be rejected because of our 'abstract conceptions of the divine nature and attributes.' Here we have the key to the lecturer's position. We are not competent judges of revelation, of God's moral nature, but must receive the records of Scripture, however the reason or the moral sense may rebel. We are not to resist, for example, such doctrines as everlasting punishment which some suppose to be contrary to the mercy of God, or the necessity of an atoning sacrifice because of our notions of God's moral nature. The world as well as the Bible

¹ 'The Mosaic Dispensation considered as introductory to Christianity.'

² 'Christian faith, comprehensive not partial, definite not uncertain.'

is full of contradictions 'to our dim views of perfect goodness.' We should not attempt to reconcile contradictions in Scripture. We should rather find out what both statements separately and together teach us. The death of Christ for example, being set forth as a sacrifice, and again as a ransom, His righteousness being imputed to believers who must also have inward holiness. It is not for us, with our limited capacities, to dwell on the contradictions. We must receive whatever is found in Scripture.

The famous Lectures on 'The Limits of Religious Thought,' by Henry Longueville Mansel, were delivered in 1858. The object, in the author's words, was to show 'what limitations to the construction of a philosophical theology necessarily exist in the constitution and laws of the human mind.' It is denied that we have any direct faculty by which, independently of all external Revelation, we can judge of the nature of God, or decide for or against the claims of any professed revelation as containing a true or a false representation of the Divine Nature and attributes.

Sir William Hamilton had laid the foundation in Metaphysics that 'the unconditioned is uncognisable and inconceivable,' and therefore our knowledge is not co-extensive with our faith. Butler had recognised in practice the limits here established in theory. Fichte made a criticism of all Revelation, but as a disciple of Kant, he ought to have first made a criticism of reason. The same impediments which make impossible a philosophy of the Infinite make impossible a complete criticism of Revelation. The limits of religious and philosophical thought are the same, so also therefore are the difficulties. As we cannot grasp the absolute nature of the divine object of religious thought, we must turn to the subject, that is the reason of man, and thus prepare the way for a recognition of the separate provinces of reason and faith. The lecturer held a brief against reason which, like Saul, in the day of battle, is made to fall on its own spear. It cannot construct a scientific theology. It cannot 'even read the alphabet out of which that theology must be framed.' We believe in an Absolute and Infinite Being, yet when we analyse our ideas of this Being, they are full of contradictions and anomalies. Our consciousness exists under the manifestation of succession and duration, and therefore, whatever we think of under these conditions is finite. Creation, as preceded by no temporal antecedent, is thus to human thought inconceivable. Our consciousness of mind is under the condition of personality, but this is essentially a limitation and a relation. Our conception of personality involves attributes apparently contradictory to the

notion of infinity, yet we must think of God as personal and believe that He is infinite.

Religion must begin with that which is above reason. Within the limits of bare reason there is no such thing as religion. Those who like Kant, maintain this thesis are like the foolish man who built his house upon the sand. The same contradictions which beset us as to the nature of God are found in those representations which more directly declare His relations to the world. The world is governed according to Scripture by general law and special interposition. This is plainly a contradiction. But those who argue from the order of nature against interposition are merely fighting against a general difficulty of all human thought. The changeless law as well as the interposition represent God under the condition of time. Both are imperfect considered speculatively, yet each may have its prototype in the ineffable being of God. The same difficulty emerges with morality. We believe there is an absolute morality, but we do not know what it is. Human morality is manifested in the form of a law of obligation, but this is not identical with, nor adequate to measure, the absolute morality of God. This is supposed to obviate objections to atonement, predestination which may not be incompatible with free will, and eternal punishment as we know not the relation of sin to infinite justice.

The conclusion is that as we cannot know the Infinite, we cannot adequately test the claim of a supposed revelation. Reason therefore, is not to be exercised on the contents of Revelation but on the evidences. Presumptions indeed, may be drawn from the internal character of the doctrines and their effects on the world, but the true evidence is the resultant of all the concurring evidences fairly examined and compared together. Internal evidence is of a negative character. It may prove in certain cases, that a religion has not come from God, but it is, in no case, sufficient to prove that it has come from Him. The crying evil of the day is the neglect or contempt of the external evidences. This is a reaction from the last century, but the strength of evidences is laid in the external because of the imperfection of our faculties which are not always capable of estimating exactly the wisdom or righteousness of particular doctrines.

The Lectures of George Rawlinson, in 1859, were a defence of the historical character of the Bible narratives, with special reference to German criticism. Christianity, as distinguished from all other religions, is essentially historical. The scheme of

doctrine is bound up with the facts, and if these are shown to be authentic, it is for all practical purposes established. The Scriptures, making allowance for 'such small errors as the carelessness or ignorance of subscribers may have produced,' are substantially the 'Word of God.'

The defence is confined to the historical evidences of this proposition. Various authors, Jew and Gentile, are quoted as giving evidence for the genuineness of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. From internal testimony it is shown that Moses wrote the Pentateuch in the wilderness. The last four books contain the events and transactions of his own time, and are therefore as reliable as the works of Cæsar or Xenophon. The book of Genesis may have been had from the patriarchs whose long lives made tradition safe, though it is also highly probable other documents were used. The Chronicles of Manetho and Berosus are found nearly to accord with the Mosaic by subtracting the mythic ages of the gods and demigods and beginning with Menes, the first historical King of Egypt.

The account of the deluge given by Berosus is substantially the same as that of Moses. Modern discoveries as to the affiliation of nations confirm that given in the tenth of Genesis. Chedorlaomer is identified in the monumental records of Babylonia. Manetho gives an account of the Exodus, though, as we might expect, a distorted one. The names of cities mentioned in Genesis as Erech, Accad and Calneh are found on bricks and stones that have been buried for nearly three thousand years in the mounds of Mesopotamia. The wars of David are mentioned by heathen writers, and the accounts of the importance of Phœnicia accord with those in the Bible. Menander and Dion relate that 'hard questions' were sent by Solomon to Hiram to be resolved by him. From the cuneiform annals of an Assyrian king, we learn the greatness of Damascus and its being ruled by Ben-Hadad, a great warrior. In this way is shown the general truth of Bible history, and from this is inferred its 'thorough truthfulness and faithful accuracy.'¹

James Augustus Hessey in 1860 lectured on 'Sunday, its Origin, History and Present Obligation.' While refusing to rest the obligation of Sunday on the fourth commandment, he regarded it as of divine institution, having been acknowledged and observed

¹ 'The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records, stated anew with special reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times.'

by the apostles. It is an ecclesiastical institution in the sense that it is apostolic, like Confirmation, Orders, and Infant Baptism. It is not ecclesiastical in the sense that it is one of those things which the Church can set aside. This was the position of Sunday in the early Church, but the Schoolmen, and so far the Church of Rome, identified it with the Jewish Sabbath. Later it was mixed up with the Christian holidays and burdened with observances. The continental Reformers took a low view of its obligation in opposition to the Church of Rome. The Puritans observed it with Jewish strictness as being obligatory from the creation of the world. In Scotland this view prevails, while on the Continent both the Roman Catholic and the Reformed keep it as a gala day. In the Church of England there are all manner of views. One of the Homilies calls it the Christian Sabbath, an expression quite unknown in the early Church. The fourth commandment is read in the service every Sunday, but is supposed to enjoin its observance only as the Lord's day, not as the Jewish Sabbath.

John Sandford, Archdeacon of Coventry in 1861, devoted the eight Lectures to the consideration of 'The Mission and Extension of the Church at Home.' He spoke of the principles of the Church of England as he understood them, the ecclesiastical destitution of the country and the necessity for more bishops and clergy. He was thankful for the change he had seen during the preceding half century, and it is refreshing to find in one of the party to which he belonged a ready recognition of the services rendered to the Church and the country by the Methodists and the Evangelical clergy.

'A Critical History of Free Thought,' by Adam Storey Farrar in 1862 was mainly historical. By free thought he meant scepticism and unbelief. He wrote, to use his own words, as a critic, not as an advocate, and confined his inquiries to the intellectual, rather than the moral causes of unbelief. Under the category of sceptics and unbelievers he included the Pagan opponents of Christianity, the liberal Schoolmen of the middle ages, the modern Deists and Atheists and the German Bible critics, and in a modified sense, Maurice and Kingsley, with the writers of 'Essays and Reviews,' who 'exhibit certain tendencies of free thought.'

In 1863 Dr John Hannah lectured on 'The Relation between the Divine and Human Elements in Holy Scripture.' In the Scriptures we have the highest operation of God's Spirit on the spirit of man. This is the purest form of spiritual influence, and as the organisation of man is complete within its own province, only elevated and enlightened, but never superseded by the help

of God, we may expect the presence of both elements in their completeness. The illustration, parallel or model of this is found in the union of the two natures in Christ. The living Word is divine and human, so also is the written Word, but as we cannot draw the line between the divine and human in the one, no more can we in the other. The lecturer starts with a consideration of the doctrine of inspiration of which revelation is commonly regarded as the counterpart and completion. But these are not co-extensive, while every part of the canonical scripture may be regarded as inspired, Revelation is not claimed for those portions of the narrative which could be derived from ordinary human sources. While Revelation goes beyond inspiration as in the case of the kind of Revelation given to the heathen, yet in its strictest sense Revelation embraces only what was revealed to the inspired writers, and not the facts which they had from human sources though they were recorded under the safeguard and guidance of perpetual inspiration.

In 1864, Thomas Dehany Bernard lectured on the Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. He started with the fact that the Bible is not a Revelation completed but the record of a Revelation in progress. One of the benefits of modern criticism is that this progressive character of Revelation is coming more distinctly before the mind of the Church. Development of progress has two meanings. It may be progress in the divine communications, or it may be only in the human apprehension. The apostolic period embraces both. There was still the divine communication, and there had begun the human apprehension. After apostolic times progress is only in the understanding of what had been revealed. Newman's doctrine of development was an invention to obviate the difficulty which had arisen through new dogmas being received in the Church of Rome for which tradition could not be alleged. The Apostles were to be led into all truth. What they teach is the development of doctrines of which the germs are in the gospels. In this way all differences of style and adaptation of language to the times of the different writers are accounted for. The suggestions of a divine Author lie behind the expressions of the human writer, and so secondary senses seem inseparable from Revelation. Some have said that the Scriptures are verbally the Word of God as absolutely as the ten commandments were written by the finger of God. This is an easy theory but not sustained by the facts, and makes 'Christianity answerable,' as Paley said, 'with its life for difficult questions connected with the old Testament.'

J. B. Mozley, in 1865, discussed the question of 'miracles' with reference to the present doubts about their intrinsic credibility. Miracles are necessary for a Revelation, though ideas might be imparted to the human mind by an ordinary act of divine power, yet miracles are necessary to prove that such ideas are true. On the supposition, therefore, of a Revelation a miracle is not an anomaly in the system of the universe. There is no ground in reason for our belief in the uniformity of nature, or that the future will be the same as the past. This is merely an inference from experience. Just as we infer cause and effect from the sequence of phenomena, so we infer an order of nature, but there is no proof in either case. What is called inductive reasoning is not reasoning. It is first observation, and then an inference made by instinct. We have from our experience a prepossession against miracles, but reason speaks for them as evidencing will, design, in other words a Personal Being. They are not against nature in reality, but are embraced under 'unknown law' or a wider view of nature. Every miracle in Scripture is as natural an event in the universe as any chemical experiment in the physical world.

The subject 'The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' of the next lecturer, Henry Parry Liddon, did not afford much scope for originality. The arguments for the Trinity were familiar. Such were the plural Elohim in Genesis i, with a singular verb and 'let *us* make man' of another verse, the Theophanies of the Old Testament, Christ's work in the world, His consciousness of Divinity, and the testimony of the Apostles, above all of St John who made it the subject of his gospel. There was also a testimony on which the lecturer laid great stress, that of 'the illuminated mind of primitive Christendom.' But after what had been written by Petavius and others about the faith of the ante-Nicene Fathers, the lecturer was bound to make significant admissions that some of the terms of the ante-Nicene Fathers, 'must be pronounced unsatisfactory' and that 'if they admit of a Catholic interpretation, they do not always invite one.' Several collateral subjects were incidentally discussed, after the usual fashion of a Bampton Lecturer. Of this kind was the defence of 'metaphysics' in religion, from the obvious fact that men must and will reason about what they believe. Pietists who undervalue doctrines not available to excite religious feeling, are in the genealogy of Rationalists. Spenser, for instance was one of the ancestors of Paulus and Strauss. Another point was the certainty of the truth and authenticity of the Pentateuch, be-

cause it was spoken of by Jesus as the work of Moses—and lastly, Christ's divinity explaining and justifying the Christian sacraments as actual channels of supernatural grace, and conversely, as a matter of history, those who deny the realities of 'sacramental grace, end in denying our Lord's Divinity.'

The question of the relation of dogma to Revelation was discussed by Edward Garbett in 1867,¹ A distinction was made between dogmatic in a good sense and in a bad. The good sense is when the dogma is identical with Revelation, and therefore infallible; the bad is when the fallible takes the tone of authority. The dogma or doctrine is the only conceivable means of 'personal attachment' to Christ. The Scriptures are a Revelation of primitive truths given once for all, and incapable of addition. Religion cannot exist without a creed.

The Lectures of George Moberly in 1868,² were a defence of the ecclesiastical principles of a party in the Church of England. They differed from those of the Church of Rome as set forth by Cardinal Manning who made the voice of the Episcopate, united to its centre, the voice of the Holy Ghost. The spirit-bearing body is co-extensive with the whole Church, lay people as well as clergy, though the clergy are the 'divinely authorised tongue,' for the proclamation of the faith. To ordained clergy alone belongs the special duty of public preaching. The Church as a body possesses gifts different from its possessions as an aggregate of individual members; these gifts are conveyed by the clergy as the appointed representatives of the whole body. Hence, the benefit in baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist.

That there exists in the Old Testament an element called prophecy which does not consist merely in its predictions but is a 'Preparation for Christ,' is the thesis of the Lectures of Robert Payne Smith, afterwards Dean of Canterbury, in 1869. The predictions were necessary to keep alive in man a confident belief in the promise of a Deliverer, but this was not the whole office of the prophets. They were teachers, God spoke *in* them, not merely by them, they prepared the world for Christ. Some prophets had supernatural communications, in others the Spirit worked within natural limits. These had the spirit of prophecy. Such were Samuel and those whom he gathered around him at Ramah. Such were the prophets in the Christian Church. All who are admitted to the office of preachers in the Church of England profess,

¹ 'The Dogmatic Faith an inquiry into the relation subsisting between Revelation and Dogma.'

² 'The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ.'

'they are moved inwardly by the Holy Ghost.' Such men as Luther and Wesley had something of the prophetic spirit, but they were not prophets in the higher sense as directly inspired either to explain old truths or to reveal new.

To discuss what Christianity was, when first given to the world was the subject of Dr William J. Irons in 1870.¹ Some doctrines popularly ascribed to St Paul are not found in his Epistles as the antithesis of faith and merit, the supposition of faith as a substitute for righteousness, the notion of election as a warrant for personal security or of predestination in the popular sense.

The Lectures of George Herbert Curteis delivered in 1871,² might be called an Eirenicon with the practical object of promoting Christian union. Jesus did not leave a book nor a system of dogmas. He left a society which was to propagate His gospel. The lecturer gives the history of the chief sects in England, dwelling mainly on their errors and short-comings. He does not, however, lay on them all the blame of separation but acknowledges, 'our plain and bounden duty as Churchmen to make a candid and honourable confession of past errors and sins in our method of managing controversies and in the relations we have assumed towards dissent.'

The lecturer for 1872 was John Richard Turner Eaton.³ The Permanence of Christianity was an argument for its truth. As Christianity had stood the test in the past so there is ground for believing that it will do so in the future. The seat of religion is in the spirit of man. Its beliefs are not products of the logical faculty. No tenets of science are to be feared, but such as affect the spiritual element. It is not necessary to defend such things as the letter of inspiration, the supremacy of authority over reason or of dogma over conscience. The religion of Jesus Christ is not an abstract creed but a regenerative power. Christianity is a progressive science in the sense that it may be verified and enlarged by discoveries in nature, the evolution of fundamental ideas and the discovery of new relations involved in them. The argument may be summed up in the words of M. Renan, quoted by the lecturer, 'The world will always be religious, and Christianity in a large sense is the last word of religion.'

In 1873 the lecturer, J. Gregory Smith, found an argument for the truth of Christianity in the character of its morality.

¹ 'Lectures on Christianity as taught by St Paul.'

² 'Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England.'

³ 'The Permanence of Christianity.'

The Greeks and Romans were satisfied to pour out their libations to the gods, or suspend the votive offering, but Christianity requires a heart, pure from taint of evil, a life devoted to what is good.¹

Stanley Leathes, in 1874,² traced the historical development of the idea of the Christ, or, as the lecturer expresses it, the religion of the Christ. The basis is found in the Old Testament, and the religions of the world, in their witness to the facts of sin, and the majesty of conscience bear indirect testimony. The promise to Abraham that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed, the king to sit upon the throne of David, and the words of such Psalms as speak of the anointed King are an evidence of the Messianic idea. Though the earliest conception of Christ is historically in the Old Testament, yet the Christ of the New Testament is an independent creation.

The 'Doctrine of Retribution' was the subject of William Jackson's Lectures in 1875. It was founded on facts of human nature or the human mind. The heathen independently of all external revelation had reached a settled conviction of right and wrong. The execution of justice may be delayed, but it is certain to come. Moral truth is the human pathway to that knowledge which is divine. The moral law being absolute, and the doctrine of retribution a truth, the present life cannot be all. The soul is not a mere rhythm of the organised body, nor morality a well-tuned music made by heart and brain. This is natural religion, not religion derived from external nature but through the nature of man.

'The Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity' by William Alexander, Bishop of Derry³ is written on the old Puritan principle that in reading the Psalms we must keep the right eye on David and the left on Christ. The Bishop disclaims any connection with those for whom the *predictive* element in prophecy is secondary or unessential.

'Christian Evidences viewed in relation to Modern Thought' was the subject chosen by C. A. Row in 1877. The lecturer found in Christianity a capacity for development or adaption to the circumstances of different ages of the world. This principle was recognised by Bishop Butler, and the mode of development was by discoveries of the meaning of Scripture in the same way as we make discoveries in nature.

¹ 'Characteristics of Christian Morality.'

² 'The Religion of the Christ.'

³ 1876.

From geology, astronomy and other sciences we have learned that some of the old interpretations of Scripture cannot stand. What we are to defend is the essence of the Christian revelation. This is not a mass of dogmatic or abstract truths, nor truth elaborated by philosophic schools, nor is it mere moral teaching. It is a historic life. The substance of the New Testament is that Jesus is the living personal Christ. As there is one revelation in nature, another in our soul, so is there a third in the person and work of Christ which is summed up as consisting of the Incarnation and its results. That Christianity is a divine revelation is shown by proving that Jesus Christ was divine, and that the accounts which we have of His life, teaching, death and resurrection are a body of historic facts. A distinction is carefully made between Christianity as a revelation and Christianity as a theology. The former is the objective facts of revelation, the latter is the science resulting from the application of our reason to these facts. The importance of this distinction is that evidence is confined to the truth of revelation, which is divine, and is not extended to theological science, which is human. The lecturer puts in the foreground of evidence what he calls the moral miracles of Christianity. This is required by the exigencies of modern thought. Moral miracles are defined as events in the moral and spiritual world, for the origin of which none of its known forces are sufficient to account. If such have taken place in Christianity there is evidence of supernatural power. This involves a definition of miracle different from the ordinary one, as for instance that of Dr Mozley who regarded the universe as a machine, and a miracle as produced by the introduction of a higher law. We are rather to take the view of God's immanence in the world, so that all the forces and energies of nature are manifestations of His ceaseless activity, and a miracle a special manifestation. Such has been the effect of the life of Jesus in the moral or spiritual world.

The Lectures for 1878 by Charles Henry Hamilton Wright, were on 'Zachariah and his Prophecies considered in relation to modern criticism.' They consisted of a new translation, a critical commentary, and a defence of the unity or genuineness of the whole book.

'To assert the positive grounds on which our faith rests, and to enforce its authority is the purpose which the present course of lectures is designed to serve,' are the words of Henry Wace, lecturer for 1879. The reason why this line is adopted is further given, that 'in consequence of the prominence of scientific habits of thought, there is grave danger of insufficient weight being

allowed to the distinct and independent claims of faith,' while it is to faith that the message of the Gospel is primarily addressed. The principle which has hitherto guided men to all that is great and good is faith. It is an instinct which God has given us, and which He will not disappoint. We believe in God, but the facts of human life present such obstacles to this belief that it needs the support afforded by the revelation of God in Christ. Conscience is a witness to faith. In spite of the apparent failures of justice in the world, men have a conviction that the violation of duty will be avenged. There is no assurance from experience that wrong-doing will be punished, yet men believe that it will. This shows that our belief in a personal God is natural. Philosophy may raise objections, but nature is stronger than philosophy. The soul of man is in contact with an awful Being from whom it cannot escape.

'The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches,' was the subject of Edwin Hatch's Lectures for 1880. The Church was in the first instance a kind of benefit club, or institution for charity. It corresponded to the Non-Christian organisations then in existence. Its officers were the same, Bishops and Deacons. The Bishops were also called Presbyters. Their chief office was to receive and administer the contributions for the poor. The Deacons were the distributors. The same name was given to those who at a religious festival distributed the meat of the sacrifice. In the second century the duties of the Bishops or Presbyters had come to be confined to a single officer, who was called the President or the Bishop. There was at first no distinction of laity and clergy. The laity enjoyed 'liberty of prophesying.' They preached and administered sacraments. The exemption of the officers of the Church from the ordinary jurisdiction of civil courts and from certain public burdens led to their distinction as a class separate from the laity.

'The One Religion,' by John Wordsworth, the present Bishop of Salisbury, is a comparison of the Biblical idea of God with that of other religions. The yearnings of humanity are only satisfied by the revelation in Christ. The truths of revelation though mysteries and such as we could not ourselves discover, yet when made known, have innumerable points of contact with human life and reason, and are consonant with all the facts of our experience.

The Lectures of Peter Goldsmith Medd in 1882 were on 'The One Mediator.' They set forth the relation of the Mediator to the universe in creation and redemption.

The fragmentary ideas which had been thrown out by Dr Arnold that in Christian times the national not the clerical organisation, the commonwealth not the associations for public worship alone constitute and carry on the work of the Church, an idea traced to Hooker, and in modern times elaborated by the German theologian Rothe, was the subject chosen by W. H. Fremantle the present Dean of Ripon, in 1883.¹ His object was in his own words, 'to restore the idea of the Christian Church as a moral and a social power, present, universal, capable of transforming the whole life of mankind and destined to accomplish the transformation.' The world which is to be saved is the organised constitution of things in which we live. The Church is that portion of human society which is renewed by the Christian spirit, a portion which must grow till it becomes the whole. St John makes the world to have been created in the Word, and St Paul speaks of all things being gathered in one in Christ. The progress is traced in history, and the modern doctrine of evolution is used to illustrate the process. The Christian ideal is the fittest and therefore by the law of survival must be supreme. Christianity is not something foreign or external to the world, but develops the course of nature and humanity. A kingdom of God is the goal to which all is tending. The Gentiles have striven after it though unconscious of the object of their striving. With Judaism and Christianity it has been the object of conscious aim and effort.

The Hebrew dispensation was a training of the people in national righteousness. It was a high ideal, not resting, as might be at first supposed, on a sacerdotal, or a dogmatic basis, or excluding God from human relations, but as including the whole range of human interests and binding together in true relations all men, and classes, and nations. An objection might be raised from Jewish exclusiveness, but it is now discovered that the ceremonial law to which alone exclusiveness belonged is an after-growth. Out of the moral power of Judaism, Christianity was born, and as the theocracy in Israel was the righteous God abiding in the nation, so the theocracy in Christendom was the righteous power abiding in mankind. The Church of Israel was the nation; not merely as gathered for worship but in the most general sense, so the Christian Ecclesia is not a select body called out from the rest and separate, but 'the whole body of the citizens called out from their homes to engage in the most

¹ 'The World as the Subject of Redemption.'

general interests of the state.' The organisation of the Christian Church grew out of its necessities at different times. It is to be a universal society, not bound to one type but adapting its institutions to the needs of mankind.

The Church became a great power in the world ; its fault was that it aimed at being not the inspirer of but a substitute for organised society. It looked upon the political or secular as evil. The clergy had separate interests from the laity. In the West the Empire passed away and the Papacy took its place. The mediæval attempt to bring the world under the dominion of Christ failed. The dominion of Christ was identified with the supremacy of the clergy ; and the so-called spiritual power became worldly. The Church needed reformation in its head and members. The Reformation was the uprising of the laity. The Reformers appealed to the people. They defended the rights of states, national life and national churches, liberty, political and religious. Calvin's commonwealth at Geneva was an effort to lay a religious basis for all the relations of men within the State. Zwingli, Musculus, and Erastus, worked in the same direction, maintaining that the civil magistrate is supreme over the whole *forum externum*, not as ruling the Church from without, but as the chief officer of the Church itself ; and that all matters of rule and external order come rightly under his control. The National Covenant of Scotland was an attempt to make the Scottish nation a kingdom of Christ and of God. In England the Reformation was a struggle for the supremacy of the crown, which meant the supremacy of the nation. Hooker's great work was a defence of the principle that national organs alone could justly frame laws for the Church system. The successors of Elizabeth, believing Episcopacy to be of divine origin, put the making of ecclesiastical laws in the hands of the clergy. This was contrary to Hooker's intentions or expectations, but he had spent his strength against the Puritans and had said nothing against the royal clerical usurpation of what belonged to Parliament as the organ of the nation, and therefore did nothing to prevent the storm which afterwards came. Toleration established by the Revolution, may be thought to have made a rent in the Church of England, but on matters of chief practical importance the people of England are one Commonwealth, one Church. This Church being the general Christian community embraces all the societies for worship which go by such names as Presbyterian, Independent, or Wesleyan, though these are commonly considered as separate Churches.

In a wider or more general elucidation of principles all human societies are considered as having a Christian basis. As the spiritual is not separate from the material, nor God apart from creation, so redemption does not remove the redeemed into a different sphere of existence, but draws them with all their surroundings into holy and loving relations. The universal Church has as yet no organisation, and the Christian nation is the fullest expression of the idea of the Church. Its rulers are alone spoken of in the New Testament as officially the 'ministers of God.'¹

Frederic W. Farrar now Dean of Canterbury, took in 1885 for his subject, a 'History of Interpretation,' dealing, however, only with those interpreters who marked the chief epochs in the progress of Biblical science. It was a journey through a weary waste of Rabbis, Fathers and Schoolmen with but little light till the clear intellect of Calvin dismissed the allegorical senses, and found that Messianic prophecies had a primary application to the events and circumstances of the times in which they were uttered and only used by the Evangelists as allusions, illustrations or adaptations. The Rabbis for the most part, regarded every word of the law as inspired and of equal value, and found many meanings in every verse, even in every monosyllable, superfluous adverb or adjunct. Letter-worship and traditionalism dating from the time of Ezra, finally became substitutes for what in the law was essential and divine. There is the same tendency among Christian theologians, who, by their theories of the absolute, supernatural, homogeneous infallibility of every word and letter contained in the Bible, have confounded the truths of God with the theological opinions of men.

The Lectures for 1886 were also historical. The lecturer, Dr Charles Bigg, chose for his subject 'The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.' They are chiefly represented by Clement and Origen. Their great merit was that they made the first systematic attempt to harmonise the traditions of faith with the free conclusions of the human intellect. They strove to reconcile the Revelation of God in Christ with the older Revelation of God in nature. What could be done at that time they did, and their principles are of permanent value. They never wrestle with science for a few inches of doubtful ground, for the ground of science is not theirs.

¹ For 1884 see under Temple.

That sense of Scripture which alone can conflict with science, is not 'the spirit that giveth life.'

The subject of W. Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, in 1887, was 'The Permanent Elements of Religion.' It was a subject for the present time, facing the difficulties arising from the recent study of religion, and showing the light shed on the subject of religion from that study. We are in a time of transition and that is always a time of doubt. The general impression is that faith is gone from the earth, but religion from its very nature can never die. It has elements that are indestructible. The nature of man is ever the same and that nature is essentially religious. But there are false religions as well as true. That religion is the likeliest to survive, which shows itself capable of meeting the wants of man's nature. Three elements are necessary, Dependence, Fellowship, Progress. In an analysis of what may be called the universal religion, these elements are found in different degrees and in different forms. In Islamism, Dependence is natural and indigenous, Fellowship is of artificial growth, Progress has no natural home. In Buddhism, Dependence is in the later developments, Fellowship is akin with its earliest features, Progress is recognised. Christianity has all the three elements. It is the manifestation of facts, laws and principles which are eternal. It does not deny the brightness and splendour of those beams of light which in all ages shone amongst men, but it points to them as proof of the eternal basis of the kingdom of God. Christianity having the elements of permanence, must be the religion of the future.

Robert Edward Bartlett in 1888, discoursed of 'The Letter and the Spirit.' The object was to discriminate between the form and the essence in Scripture exegesis, in the organisation and constitution of the Church, in the sacraments, in Christian doctrines and ordinances. Inspiration does not guarantee the adequacy and perfection of the prophets' written or spoken utterances. It tends rather the other way, for the spirit is thwarted by the letter and the prophet cannot fully utter the truth that is in him. This and such like things are to be considered when we deal with the sacred books. The danger of allegorical interpretation is very great. Yet the utterances of prophets and psalms may admit of other applications when they turn not on local and temporary but on eternal principles. The popular notion of the Bible has sprung up from preconceived ideas of what a hand-book of religion should be instead of considering what it actually is. The characteristic of the Bible is its

perfectly human tone. It is not so much an inspired book as the writing of inspired men. The New Testament writers quote the Old without any reference to the original meaning of what they quote. The Church has not any given form of organisation, but takes organisation from the condition of society. There was no form of government instituted by Christ or His Apostles. Christians were left to organise themselves under the formative guiding and influence of the Spirit. The essence of the Church does not depend on its ministry, for then it would be not of the Spirit but of the letter. Baptism and the Eucharist have been materialised by the same substitution of the letter for the spirit. Allegories and metaphors have been taken literally, till baptism has become a charm by which a mysterious inward change is wrought in an unconscious soul and eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood are a transubstantiation of the sacramental elements into the real body and blood. Christian doctrine like the Church itself is a growth. The creeds of one age are not suitable for another. Theology is progressive. The freedom of the Spirit should be in worship and in the Christian life. The Church of the future will contain all the elements of good that have been evolved out of past experiences.

Dr Thomas Kelly Cheyne, in 1889, lectured on the 'Origin and religious contents of the psalter in the light of the Old Testament criticism and history of religion.' It was the application of modern criticism to the psalms, many of which are shown to have been written after the Babylonian exile.

Henry William Watkins, Archdeacon of Durham, set forth the whole case of 'Modern Criticism considered in its relations to the fourth gospel' in 1890. With the third generation of the second century there is abundant evidence of the existence of this gospel, and that it was accounted the work of St John. With the previous generation there was some difficulty especially as Justin Martyr does not quote from the gospels, only from 'The Memoirs of the Apostles,' but from the conditions under which he wrote, direct references to the Evangelists were not to be expected. Moreover there is good ground for believing that by 'Memoirs' Justin meant the four Gospels. Since the best books were written on the other side discoveries have been made which must have convinced all parties, such as that of a MS. of the Clementine Homilies in 1837, in which the fourth gospel is quoted, and the long lost Diatesseron of Tatian who was the pupil of Justin, and from which it is proved that the fourth gospel had already taken a fixed place along with the synoptics.

Charles Gore followed up in his Bampton Lectures in 1891 the subject which had raised an orthodox panic when treated of in *Lux Mundi*.¹ Christianity is defined as faith in the person of Jesus Christ. The vindication or exposition of this faith involves theological or metaphysical propositions. This is a necessary result from the rationality of man, he must and will reason. Hence dogma or doctrine. The Church is not committed to any definite dogma on such questions as the atonement or the inspiration of the Scriptures, but it is committed beyond recall to the doctrines about God and Christ as contained in the Nicene creed. This is said by way of preparation, the lecturer feeling himself bound to accept and defend what is called the Catholic interpretation of Christian doctrine and to identify it with the actual revelation in the Scriptures.

Christ is supernatural yet natural. He is the crown of creation, the completion of that order of creation in which God makes Himself manifest. The term supernatural is purely relative to what at any particular stage of thought, we mean by nature. Any new development may be called supernatural ; so miracles are not a violation of nature but the natural phenomena ; what we expect from the higher nature. The whole argument is a rational defence of orthodox theology in the sense of orthodoxy as understood by the term Catholic. But it is just this which draws attention to the lecturer's heresies. He makes even the mysteries of the Catholic faith to be rational doctrines. Though reason could not discover them, they are agreeable to reason. The Catholic creeds teach the true and perfect humanity of Jesus Christ. He was truly God, but He was as truly man. Though this is the Catholic faith, Catholics have been afraid of it. They have so leaned to the Divinity as to think that the Humanity of Jesus, from the first moment of His existence, possessed perfect actual knowledge of all reality, past, present, and future. The New Testament is on the side of the Catholic faith that Jesus 'grew in wisdom as He grew in stature,' a real growth in mental apprehension and spiritual capacity as in bodily stature. The human experiences attributed in the New Testament to Jesus are or seem to be inconsistent with practical omniscience. In St Matthew and St Mark, He is reported to have said that of the day and the hour of judgment He knew nothing. In St John, He is spoken of as accomplishing what the Father taught Him, and doing what He saw the Father do. He adds nothing out of His supposed omni-

¹ The Incarnation of the Son of God.

science to our physical or historical knowledge. His exclamation on the cross 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me,' shows that He had a human experience and human passions. St Paul describes the Incarnation as a self-emptying. Jesus emptied Himself of that which, as the Divine Word, He had in the glory of the Father, that He might become man. He was in the *form* of God but He took the *form* of a servant. For our sakes He became poor. The Incarnation was 'self-beggary.' The impossibility of reconciling the Divinity with the Humanity of Christ is fully admitted, because of the impossibility of our knowing God in the fulness of His Being. This self-limitation involved in the Incarnation takes away the validity of all arguments for the genuineness of the Books of the Old Testament from their being quoted by Christ. He alluded to them by their recognised names just as men will speak of the Iliad and Odyssey as the poetry of Homer, though they may reckon them as of composite origin. The one hundred and tenth Psalm may not be David's though Jesus quoted it as David's.

In 1893 Dr William Sanday lectured on the 'The Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration.' A change he said, had come over the conception of Biblical Inspiration. The Bible had in our time been studied like any other book and we must look at the results. The Bible is to tell its own story and we must not assume beforehand that it has nothing distinctive because it must be studied like other books. The turning point in the history of the canon is at the end of the second century. Many books that had passed as gospels and epistles were now rejected. Those retained as Canonical possessed special properties or attributes, and were considered as inspired by the Holy Ghost. Some regarded this inspiration as extending to the histories and even to the numbers in the sacred books. Others recognised degrees of inspiration. The prophets had visitations of the Spirit, but Christ had perpetual inspiration. The Jews attributed inspiration to books which were not in the canon, but to the Canonical books they ascribed authority. The formation of the canon was a gradual work, and to this there is an analogy in the doctrine of inspiration. The typical idea of inspiration was prophecy, and this was ultimately extended to other writings beside the prophetic. About the end of the second century the general view of inspiration was much the same as was common with us fifty years ago. The difference was in the list of books which constituted the Bible. The modern theory of inspiration is arrived at by examining the consciousness of the Bible writers, and inquiring

what they give us to understand as their notion of inspiration. The conclusion is, that both these ideas of inspiration are admissible. The difference is that in the old view, the Bible is the Word of God, in the modern the Word of God is in the Bible.

In 1894, the lecturer was John Richardson Illingworth. His subject was 'Personality Human and Divine.' The lectures run out into the question of what is personality, the person of Christ, and the personality of God. They scarcely admit of analysis. The basis is Lotze's metaphysical idea that God is the only person. Person is defined as one who as subject is an object to himself. Personality is the only reality. It distinguishes man from the world of mere animals and things, and relates him to a spiritual order.

HULSEAN LECTURES

A FULL account was given of the Bampton Lectures in the belief that from them might be gathered a general idea of the religious thought of the century. Other lectures may be not less important but they go over the same ground and do not require extended notice. The first is the Hulsean, the object of which in the words of the founder was 'The Evidences of Revealed Religion against notorious Infidels, whether Atheists or Deists, not descending to any particular sects or controversies amongst Christians themselves, except some new and strange error, either of superstition or enthusiasm as Popery or Methodism.' The will of John Hulse was dated 1789, but the revenues were not sufficient to begin the Lectures till 1820. The first lecturer, C. Benson, discoursed of the peculiar office of the different branches of evidence as miracle and prophecy, and the eternal scheme and constitution of the gospel, and in the year following, on evidence drawn from the discourses of Jesus. James Clarke Franks had for his subject in 1823 the preaching and vindication of the gospel to Jews, Samaritans, and devout Gentiles as shown in the Acts, the Epistles of St Peter and in that to the Hebrews. Temple Chevallier in 1826 discoursed of the types of the Old Testament as fulfilled in the New. These were not merely pious and ingenious adaptations but intended by God, and showed unity of plan. The following year the same lecturer argued for Divine Power and Wisdom as evidenced by astronomy.

In a dissertation on the proper understanding of the Mosaic writings, J. J. Blunt in 1831 refuted Milman's History of the

Jews. Abraham was not the leader of a Nomadic tribe but a stranger and pilgrim seeking a city. The Old Testament should be read with reference to the prevailing expectation of the Messiah. The tendency of recent theological literature is to suppress the doctrine of redemption. The same lecturer discoursed next year of the undesigned coincidences of the historical books of the Old Testament as proving their veracity. Henry James Rose in 1833 refuted the German critics of the Pentateuch.

By the will of John Hulse, the Lectures were to be twenty. By a decree of the Court of Chancery they were reduced to eight. Henry Howarth, in 1835 discoursed of the 'Two Extremes of the Age, Enthusiasm and Unbelief.' Which of the two was worse was left doubtful. The writers of the Bible, though writing at different times had one plan. They set forth a doctrine or dogmatic faith as necessary to salvation. Next year the same lecturer proved that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ of God.

Rationalism and revelation was the subject of Richard Parkinson in 1837. Rational Christians were classed with Deists, and said to be refuted by Butler and Paley. The lecturer, however, argued, in imitation of Dr Chalmers in his Bridgewater Treatise, for the doctrines of Christianity from the moral and intellectual constitution of man and his relation towards external nature. Revelation is addressed to conscience. The Rationalist has a part, and what he has shows the need of the whole. Revelation is the complement which makes the document intelligible. The Bible account of the fall of man is literally true. Progressive revelation is contrary to the idea of revelation. The same lecturer in 1838, discoursed of the Church, a long neglected subject but now revived. This was an allusion to the Oxford Tracts. In 1837, T. Theyre Smith on 'Man's Responsibility for what he believes,' maintained it was the same as for what he does. The same lecturer in 1840 showed the agreement between Christianity and the principles of morality. Christianity appeals to man's moral nature.

Henry Alford in 1841 had for his subject the doctrine of Redemption. The doctrines of the gospel as sin, pardon, sacrifice and substitution were the same in all dispensations and plainly revealed. The subject was continued next year, the lecturer showing how the gospel meets the wants of man's nature. An 'Examination of certain Passages in our Lord's Conversation with Nicodemus,' was the subject of the Lectures of John Howard Marsden in 1843, and next year the 'Evils which resulted from a misunderstanding of our Lord's Miracles.'

The subject of Richard Chenevix Trench in 1845, was the fitness of Holy Scripture for unfolding the spiritual life of man. The argument for the things which we believe was drawn from within ; 'their inner glory, their manifest fitness.' Next year the same lecturer discoursed of Christ, the Desire of Nations, or the unconscious Prophecies of Christendom. To the Christian revelation all lines consciously or unconsciously tended. Parallels to the doctrines and precepts of Christianity had been urged to prove that it was no new revelation, but in these expectations the world was divining and feeling after what it needed. The nations yearned though they knew not for what they yearned. There was a craving for something more than the heroic, for something divine, a Divine Person. Christopher Wordsworth in 1847, discoursed of the canon of Scripture. He took the clear Protestant ground that Scripture is the rule of faith. The canon comes to us on the testimony, not on the authority of the Church. The original canon did not include the Apocrypha. The Scripture is God's word written, but not because it is written.

William Gilson Humphry in 1849, preached sermons on the doctrine of a future state. He found it among the Heathen who were not without some light from heaven, and the Jews looked for a better country. Next year the subject of the same lecturer was the early progress of the Gospel as evidence of its truth.

George Currey in 1851, lectured on the 'Preparation for the Gospel,' and the next year on the 'Confirmation of Faith by Reason and Authority.' Benjamin Morgan Cowie in 1854 on 'Scripture Difficulties.' 'The Doctrines and Difficulties of the Christian Faith contemplated from the stand-point afforded by the Catholic Doctrine of the Being of our Lord Jesus Christ,' was the subject of Harvey Goodwin. The lecturer wished to get a point of view from which these difficulties were not felt to be difficulties. The grounds of faith were not demonstrable as definite propositions with mathematical precision. As the teaching of the Church was prior to that of the Bible, there is no necessity for clearing up all difficulties arising from Bible criticism. The subject was continued in 1856 under the title of 'The Glory of God the Father seen in the Manhood of Christ.'

Charles Anthony Swainson in 1857, defended the creeds of the Church as opposed to private judgment and Papal authority. In the following year his subject was the authority of the New Testament. C. J. Ellicot in 1859, objected to the principle of considering the Bible as an organised whole. The canon of

Scripture was not settled till the seventh or eighth century, and therefore a firmer and more solid ground must be sought to establish the authority of the New Testament. This is found in the teaching of the Apostles. Their commission from Jesus Christ gave them authority to speak, and what they said was truth. The Apostolic Fathers claimed for themselves both revelation and inspiration. Milton and Shakespeare had inspiration to write their works, but not of so high a kind as that of the writers of the New Testament. It is best not to have any theory of inspiration, enough to say that the Scriptures contain the thoughts and the mind of God. The same lecturer in 1859 discoursed of the life of Christ, the great subject to which all controversies of the present day converge.

The Lectures in 1860, by John Lamb, are on the seven words spoken against the Lord Jesus, or an investigation of the motives which led His contemporaries to reject Him.

The Lectures of Charles Merivale in 1861, were not printed. By a new statute after this the lectures were not bound to exceed four. John Saul Howson in 1862 lectured on the 'Character of St Paul.' Daniel Moore in 1864, made his subject the 'Criticism of the Old Testament,' and 'Modern Lives of Jesus Christ by Unbelievers.' He threw the burden of proving that God had not spoken on the unbelievers, and boasted of a triumphant refutation of all objections to the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures.

'The growth of Jesus Christ in wisdom,' was the subject of James Moorhouse, in 1865. That rational Christianity ended in the denial of Revelation was seen in the inability of philosophy to solve the problem of the union between God and man. Christ's humanity was perfect, not mixed with the Divinity as the Apollonarians said, yet the Divinity continually elevated the humanity which in time became an ever more perfect organ for His Divinity. In some things Jesus may have had information in the ordinary way; some important things He may have inquired into. As He did not know the day and the hour of His coming, He may not have known such a much less important thing as the authorship of a particular passage.

Edward Henry Perowne in 1866 lectured on the 'Godhead of Jesus Christ,' showing it to be the foundation of the fabric of Christianity; the keystone of the arch. Next year C. Pritchard traced the analogies between the progress of Nature and of Grace. He found a correlation between the scheme of revealed Religion and that of Nature, physical and social. Together they exhibit a

continuity of plan. The God of Nature is the God of the Bible. In the deposition of coal fields in the far back geological ages there is a prophecy concerning a race of intelligent beings who were to subdue the earth. The intellectual faculties of man are a prophecy of his immortality. The revelation made at sundry times suited the capacities of the people in the respective ages ; up to them but never beyond them. There is a continuity to be traced in the relativity of the divine revelations. The Mosaic cosmogony is in accordance with the notions prevalent when Genesis was written. There was a break in continuity when man was introduced upon the earth. There was then a leap into consciousness and so there is a gap between man and the lower animals. That progress should be slow is the law of all created things. Human knowledge comes through the gift of genius with which God has inspired some favoured men. The progress of the Christian faith has been mysteriously slow, yet this corresponds to what we see in nature.

J. J. Stewart Perowne in 1868, lectured on Immortality. He spoke of the hopes of the heathen and the immortality of philosophy. The silence of the Old Testament seemed broken in some of the Psalms, but Christ plainly brought life and immortality to light. J. Venn in 1869 took for his subject some of the characteristics of belief, scientific and religious. Belief is distinguished from faith. The one rests solely on evidence ; the other is belief with a moral element, that is confidence in God and Christ. W. F. Farrar discoursed in 1870 on the 'Witness of History to Christ.' The present age was destitute of faith yet terrified by scepticism. The storm now rages about the very ark of God, but neither philosophy nor criticism has shaken one truth of Christianity. One evidence of its truth is 'the unique sovereign influence of the person of Christ.' Others are the victorious triumph of faith and the blessing it has been to the world. F. J. A. Hort in 1871, instead of giving a lecture preached a sermon on 'The Way, the Truth and the Life.' In 1873, Stanley Leathes took for his subject 'The Gospel its own Witness.' Christianity is not beliefs but facts, and these have had and still have influence. The Gospel professes to supply our need and appears constituted to do so. It has evoked a new literature. The New Testament stands alone and unrivalled in the purity and elevation of its teaching. The facts of Christianity are not the subject of scientific demonstration any more than other historical facts, but the moral truths which have these facts for their foundation have an inherent and abiding influence. The Lectures for 1874 de-

livered in 1875, were on sin as set forth in Holy Scripture, by George M. Straffen. Edward T. Vaughan in 1875, considered some reasons for Christian hope. He found Christianity adapted to the deepest wants of our nature. G. S. Drew in 1877 found in the human Life of Christ a revelation of the order of the Universe. In His human life, we see the whole order of being. He was not only the ideal of humanity but of the universe as illumined by the thought of God.

W. Boyd Carpenter in 1878, spoke of the Witness of the Heart to Christ. Christianity has become the religion of the civilised world and is still winning the hearts of men. Conscience, love and hope bear witness of its truth.

Joseph Foxley in 1881, refuted Secularism, Scepticism, Ritualism and Libertinism with the usual arguments.

Charles F. Watson in 1882, made war on modern Biblical criticism, in discoursing of the law and the prophets. The witness of the Jewish Church in the Old Testament ought to be received. The Jews spoke of the law and the prophets, but modern critics speak of the prophets and the law. It is not to be believed that the Jews would have received sacerdotal legislature from Ezra. They would have objected to such cumbersome ceremonies, as things of which their fathers knew nothing. The new law restricting ancient freedom was alien to the spirit of the prophets. If Deuteronomy had been a forgery in the time of Jeremiah, it would have been detected.

J. J. Lias in 1883, viewed the atonement in the light of certain difficulties. Much of what passes for Scripture doctrine is merely human inference. The words Mediator, Atonement, Remission, have had popular ideas imported into them. The mediatorial office should not be confined to Christ's sufferings on the cross. It includes His spotless life of love and mercy, all that He has done for us and is doing now. The word atonement has no intimation of the process by which revelation is made. Propitiation does not imply that divine wrath was appeased. No œcumenical council has ever decided how Christ's sufferings availed to put away sin. This is the only subject on which no early Father ever ventured to dogmatise. It was reserved for Protestant theology to make Christ's death rather than His incarnation the keystone of the Gospel.

W. Cunningham essayed in 1885 to determine St Augustine's place in Christian thought. Origen and Augustine, the one representing the East, the other the West, were the first of the Fathers who aspired to be philosophers, and to combine the

knowledge they had from all sources into a consistent scheme. The earlier Fathers had determined the meaning of Christian doctrine for all time. What they did is embodied in the creeds and is final, but in Christian philosophy there is no finality. The doctrines of Augustine are supposed to be identical with those of Calvin, but this is a mistake. Augustine did not teach total depravity. With him, sin was a defect in human nature. There are elements of goodness in the most depraved. Man has free-will, and divine fore-knowledge is not predestination. The Church of England at the Reformation followed Augustine not Calvin. It could not desert the old paths.

H. M. Stephenson in 1888, showed the connection between the wants of human nature and the offer of the gospel in lectures on 'Christ, the Life of Men.' J. B. Heard in 1892, contrasted Alexandrian theology with Carthaginian. With the one God was immanent in the world, with the other transcendent. The idea of immanency has in our time displaced that of transcendency. We now believe in a Divine Word indwelling in man. M. Creighton in 1893 lectured on persecution and tolerance. Persecution was alien to the spirit of Christianity. When Christians have persecuted it has mainly been in the interest of political order, in the belief that some religious opinions were hostile to the State. Alfred Barry was lecturer for 1894. His lectures were historical. The subject was on Ecclesiastical expansion of England in the growth of the Anglican Communion.

BOYLE LECTURES

By the will of the Honourable Robert Boyle in 1691, eight sermons were to be preached every year 'for proving the Christian Religion against notorious infidels, viz., Atheists, Theists, Pagans, and Mahometans.' There was no obligation to print the Sermons and for the first half of the century very few were printed.

In 1802-5, the lecturer was Van Mildert.¹ In 1821 the lecturer was William Harness. His subject was 'The Connection of Human Happiness with Christianity.' The argument was that Christianity is essential for the happiness of man as a member of Society, and next to his happiness as an individual. Without the restraints of Christianity there would be no real happiness for any one.

¹ See *Supra*, p. 38.

In 1846-7 the lecturer was F. D. Maurice. His subject was the 'Religions of the World and their Relation to Christianity.'

In 1854 Christopher Wordsworth was the lecturer. He hoped he was carrying out the founder's intention by lecturing on such subjects as national sins, tithes, the necessity for bishops and more of them.

Edward Garbett was lecturer in 1861-2-3. Each year produced a volume. The first was called 'The Bible and its Critics,' the second, 'The Conflict between Science and Infidelity,' and the third 'The Divine Plan of Revelation,' an argument from internal evidence in support of the structural unity of the Bible. The Bible critics were classed as unbelievers, and the answer to them was the proof that the Bible though written at different times and by different persons had a unity of plan. In 1864-5 Charles Merivale discoursed on the Conversion of the Roman Empire, and the Conversion of the Northern Nations. The lectures were mainly historical, but the argument was that Christianity has made its own way in the world, by its inherent goodness. 'The lives of Christians,' the writer said, 'has ever been the best and surest argument for Christianity.'

Charles Hayes Plumptre in 1866, lectured on Christ and Christendom. He made a survey of the Life of Christ with special notice of several recent Lives of Jesus. In our day men are asking for a living Christ. The books which have the strongest hold on thoughtful men are not those in which the genuineness and truth of the gospels are defended, but those which lead men to bow down in homage before the majesty of the divine life.

Stanley Leathes was lecturer 1868-9-70. The first year the subject was 'The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ.' The second year 'St Paul's Witness,' and the third, that of St John. Robert Boyle had said in his will that the lectures were not to descend to any controversies among Christians themselves. But this requirement was now to be set aside, for the enemy was more within than without. People who gave up the substance of Christianity still called themselves Christians. There were some who professed to believe Christianity and yet denied the resurrection of Jesus, but St Paul made this the chief subject of his preaching.

James Augustus Hessey, in 1871-72 treated of the moral difficulties connected with the Bible. Some parts of the Bible seem to do violence to the moral sense as the imprecations in the Psalms, the destruction of the Canaanites, Jael's smiting Sisera. We are not supposed to approve of such acts. God uses the instrumen-

tality of men as they are, such as time and circumstances made them.

Henry Wace in 1874-5 lectured on 'Christianity and Morality, or the Correspondence of the Gospel with the Moral Nature of Man.' The sense of right and wrong implies an intimate relation to a spiritual world and to a Divine Person. It involves spiritual cravings for which Christianity alone offers adequate satisfaction. Christianity as embodied in the creeds and formularies is now in danger from philosophers, men of science and critics who profess to be Christians with only the creed of Christ. By abandoning the historical basis, they obstruct the realisation of the very truth which they admire. If that is shaken, no cravings of our nature can sustain the superstructure. The creeds and formularies are distinguished from hard schemes of salvation, in which some truths of the New Testament have been petrified. But the Christian Church advances by means of splendid errors which are a partial reflection of the truth. Salvation is not a scheme but the restoration of health to the soul. Jesus identified Himself with men, tasted the very dregs of evil, and uttered towards God the bitter grief which that evil entailed. The lecturer acknowledged, on this subject, his obligation to M'Leod Campbell whose views he adopted.

Alfred Barry in 1876, proposed to answer the question, 'What is Natural Theology?' or to try to estimate the cumulative evidence of the many witnesses for God. Under some form, belief in God is universal. The conception of God like that of right and wrong is naturally inherent. This conception is natural religion. What we call natural light is, in a sense revelation, and special revelations are parts of natural religion. The supernatural is not præternatural. Revelation is natural, and the complement of natural theology. Christianity brings out the personality of a living God, and the true spirituality of man. In Christ we have the true solution of the great problem of being. In 1877-8 the same lecturer discoursed on 'The Manifold Witness of Christ.'

'The Evidential Value of the holy Eucharist' was the subject of J. F. Maclear in 1879.

George Herbert Curteis in 1884, considered the 'Scientific Obstacles to Christian Belief.' During the latter half of this century the foundations of Christian belief had been rudely shaken. In the history of the Church there had been four great waves of unbelief. One was Gnosticism which made the personal God an abstraction and the world the creation of a secondary

power. The world being a blunder, it was to be rectified by Christ. The second was in the time of Abelard who wished to reconstruct theology on lines independent of the traditional ways of the Church. Then after the Reformation, a reconstruction began with Bacon and ended in Deism. The fourth is in our time originating with Darwin and leading to materialism, some ascribing all activity to the sun and so returning to the worship of Baal. Though holding fast the dogmatic faith of the traditional creeds, the lecturer allowed for great variety of expression. The verbal formularies may pass away but the truths they contain will remain. Miracles which once propped up and protected the Christian faith are now a difficulty. The fall and redemption may be understood in a scientific form rather than in the literal Biblical form. We have not certainty but faith, the trust of the heart.

The Boyle Lecturer in 1890 was T. G. Bonney. His subject was 'Old Truths in New Lights.' He treated of the present conflict between science and theology. In the preface he spoke of *Lux Mundi*, remarking that it will force the High Church party to abandon much which has hitherto been regarded by them as of primary importance. In this book the necessity of applying scientific principles to the treatment of theological questions is virtually admitted. 'Christian Doctrine and Modern Thought' was the subject of the second course of lectures. The lecturer allowed to science absolute freedom. It may investigate as best it can the book of nature without being under any obligation to bring its results into harmony with the book of Genesis. Men who have had a scientific education are slow to admit any finality in the expression of truth. A creed or a decree of a council is only the nearest approximation to the expression of truth which could be made by the best judges of the epoch when it was made. Modern science has replaced anthropomorphic ideas of the Creator by others which are far better and more elevated. The Trinity is seen in analogies of nature, where, with a difference of position we find an underlying unity of essence. The conception of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels is not hard to believe. At such an epoch and for such an event as the Incarnation, a miracle might be anticipated. The fall of man is the imperfection of human nature, and atonement is the averting of the natural consequences of sin. The resurrection may be the acquisition of a new organisation without the identity of the molecular constituents for an identity of personal consciousness. Reviewing past experiences the lecturer said 'I have lived long

enough to see opinions once loudly denounced become generally accepted, and the men who were esteemed by one generation champions of orthodoxy, regarded in the next, as little better than the knights of *La Mancha*.' Then as to the future, 'There is work enough to do in the nineteenth century, there is a crisis coming which will test the strength of every Christian man and woman. I will speak of our own land and our own Church only, though the coming struggle is not thus limited. This is not the time for questions of vestments and ritual. These are at best but the 'tithing of mint, anise and cummin,' at worst, too often the remnants of old worn-out superstitions which are dying hard as such things always die.

Alexander James Harrison lectured in 1893 on the 'Ascent of Faith or the Grounds of Certainty in Science and Religion.' Unbelievers of all kinds believe more than they are conscious of. From our standpoint they are shown what they ought to believe as following from what they do believe. These new necessities and obligations point to the Catholic faith. All who are not Catholics, in the degree that they are uncatholic are Agnostics. Such are the Denominationalist who rejects the Catholic doctrine of unity, the Scripturalist who does not admit the infallibility of the Church, the Unitarian who denies the Trinity, and the Deist who does not believe in Revelation.

In 1895 Canon Newbolt lectured on 'The Gospel of Experience, or the Witness of Human Life to the Truth of Revelation.' Borrowing the idea of evidence from excavations of mounds, tombs, and buried ruins, the lecturer is to excavate human experience. He finds evidence for the existence of a personal Deity in the universality of worship in the sense of sin, and the disposition of man for sacrifice and prayer. He finds traces of the fall in the present degradation of man, in his heredity, his environment, and his being subject to temptation, the last not merely from the disposition to evil, but from a personal temptation. Redemption is seen in the development of character and the longing for a higher ideal. The argument is mixed up with the lecturer's views of the necessity of Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution, and belief in the extension of the Incarnation through the Sacraments.

WARBURTONIAN LECTURES

THESE are so like each other and so often repeat what is familiar, that only a few of them require any special notice. The first in

the century was by Archdeacon Nares in 1800-1-2-3-4, who proved, as Warburton had desired in his will, that the Pope is the Man of Sin.

Edward Pearson, Master of Sydney Sussex College, in 1807-11 answered objections from the difficulty of reconciling the divine fore-knowledge with free will in man. He followed, if he did not originate the theory that God may not have any fore-knowledge of those actions of His intelligent creatures in which they are free. The appellation of the Man of Sin to the Pope was not admitted, but he was the lamb-like beast in the Apocalypse and some other beasts in Daniel and St John.

Philip Allwood in 1812-5, demonstrated that the Church of Rome was that Babylon which had never repented of her evil deeds, such as the massacre of St Bartholomew and the blood shed in England in the days of Queen Mary. The mighty angel whose face was as the sun, was Martin Luther. The book in his right hand was the open Bible. His right foot was on the earth, and his left on the sea, which signified his influence over many nations. He cried with a loud voice because of the great necessity for reformation. The reformed Churches are the hundred and forty and four thousand with the Lamb on Mount Zion.

John Davison, Fellow of Oriel, who had a great reputation as a scholar, and was much esteemed by his contemporaries, lectured in 1819-20, on the 'Nature and History of Prophecy,' with an estimate of its value as one of the evidences of Christianity. These lectures were unlike any of those that preceded them. More than usual importance was attached to the moral and doctrinal aspect of prophecy though the predictive element was fully recognised. From the fall of man to his redemption, prophecy had been the herald and messenger of divine truth. It ever looked forward to the gospel. Jacob was able to predict that the sceptre would be in the tribe of Judah and would not depart till Christ came. Prophecy spoke of a temporal kingdom, and also of an Evangelical. The first bore the stamp of the second. This double sense was unfolded in the roll of history. The minor prophets have many prophecies concerning Christ and His kingdom, and of these the fulfilment has been so complete as to reach the standard of perfection. Davison objected to Pearson's speculations about the divine foreknowledge.

W. Rowe Lyall after the lapse of ten or twelve years published his Lectures for 1824 under the title of *Propædia Prophetica*. The progress of Christianity was brought about by the fulfilment

of prophecy. Men's minds were prepared for an event which came.

J. Nolan, 1832-7, found prophecy to correspond to all the periods of the world's history. The Pope is the Beast, and the two witnesses are Daniel and St John who bore witness to his apostacy.

Alexander McCaul in 1837-41, though a strong Protestant, thought the Antichrist was to be the destroyer of Papal Rome, and so not the Pope.

Benjamin Harrison, 1841-5, thought the Papal Empire was the Beast, and Papal Rome Babylon. The two witnesses were the national churches that had kept the faith.

Frederick Denison Maurice, in 1845-9, did not much believe in the coincidences which the other lecturers had regarded as fulfilled prophecies. He rather sought to find some law which would connect the facts of ecclesiastical history. Only a part of the Lectures were published, and these are not among the most intelligible of the author's writings.¹

E. H. Clifford in 1874, avoided speaking of the Beast, the scarlet woman, and all that was supposed to refer to the Church of Rome. Benjamin Morgan Cowie did the same in 1875 interpreting the Babylon of the Apocalypse as Pagan Rome.

The lecturer in 1880-4, was Dr Alfred Edersheim, a Christian Hebrew. He called his Lectures 'Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah.' The Messianic idea of the Old Testament was, he said, fulfilled in Christ. The fulfilment of a prophecy was not always literal. Prophecy is not predicted history. It always had a contemporaneous meaning, and contemporaneous lessons to those to whom it was first addressed. As the meaning unfolded in the course of history it conveyed to each succeeding generation something new, bringing to each fresh lessons. This does not mean a two-fold application which is called a 'clumsy device,' nor is it progression or development, but an unfolding of the present.

Dr A. F. Kirkpatrick was lecturer in 1886-90. He paid but little attention to special fulfilments of prophecy, dwelling rather on the drift and tendency of a manifold and complex preparation pointing to an end, foreshadowed but not described. The burden of the Lectures was to exhibit the distinctive characteristics of the teaching of the prophets in relation to their own times, in the belief that this might be a contribution towards the elucidation

¹ For the Lectures in 1849-50, see *supra* p. 67, under E. B. Elliot.

of the evidential value of the Old Testament. Judaism was not, as Kuenen had said, merely one of the principal religions of the world, but a preparation for a special divine revelation. The lecturer admitted his departure from the principles of Warburton and those of his time, who made the fulfilment of prophecy and miracles the most convincing proofs of the truth of Christianity. Though the extreme results of modern science and criticism are to be deplored they have not been without a wholesome influence on Christian thought. They have taught us to look for God's revelation of Himself in His ordinary not less than in His extraordinary modes of working. Prophecy and miracles are now placed in a truer light though they take their real place only among the subordinate evidences of Christianity. The prophecies concerning Josiah and Cyrus where they are mentioned by name were probably written during or after their life-time. The Book of Kings did not take its present form till after the reign of Josiah, and the prediction concerning Cyrus is in the second Isaiah.

Christian students must now recognise that the Old Testament must be studied critically and historically. They must also take a larger view of the prophet's work. He was not merely a predictor but one endued with insight as well as foresight. His work was concerned with the present. He was a preacher of righteousness. Prophecy was not 'unveiled history,' nor as Bishop Butler said, 'the history of events before they come to pass.' Fulfilment is related to prophecy as the plant to the seed. Apart from experience the fulfilment could not be foretold. We are not to consider the matter settled by anything which was said by Jesus or His Apostles. They settled no critical questions. Though there are no direct fulfilments of single prophecies, yet Christ was the goal to which the Old Testament pointed. In His office and in His person He summed up and fulfilled all that prophecy had foreshadowed.¹

¹ In the accounts of all the above-mentioned Lectures an effort has been made to give at least a list of the names of the lecturers and their subjects. Barry's Bampton for 1892, 'Some Lights of Science on the Faith,' was not at hand when wanted. Bonney's Hulsean for 1884 were not in Sion College. Wordsworth's for 1868 were omitted by accident. The others not mentioned do not seem to have been printed.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER II

OMISSIONS .

THERE are several writers whom it was intended to notice, but it was found they either represented no special phase of thought, or only one represented by others.

The first in chronological order is Sydney Smith, who was a critic and politician more than a theologian. His contributions to literature were in the way of review articles, sermons, letters, and things ephemeral, evoked by the events of his time. He might be called a reformer, though he opposed the more equitable distribution of church property. This subject he viewed from the standpoint of a well-endowed stall in St Paul's Cathedral. He advocated revision and shortening of the Liturgy, to the length of which he ascribed the empty pews of many churches. He was devoted to the Church of England in its aspect of an establishment. He hated Roman Catholics, and he had but little affection for Protestant Dissenters, but he strenuously advocated that both should have their civil rights. To the cry of the Church in danger he answered that this could never be so long as the Church was true to itself, and did justice to others, but 'establishments die of dignity, they are too proud to think themselves ill and take a little physic.' The Church of England was not popular, and unless some great changes were made, would not exist for another half century. Many of the changes which he longed to see came in his life-time. In a sermon preached on the accession of the Queen, he said, 'I have lived to see the improvement of the Church of England, all the power of persecution destroyed, the monopoly of civil affairs expunged from the book of the law, and all its unjust and exclusive immunities levelled to the ground. The Church of England is now a rational object of love and admiration.'

Missionary and Tract Societies were the object of his everlasting hatred. He regarded both as the enemies of the Church, and of common sense. His great argument against all whom he called Methodists was the absurdity of supposing that the 'Creator of the world' would interfere to convert men. He admitted the probability of divine interference with the general laws of nature, when some great object was to be obtained, such, for instance, as the temporal deliverance or destruction of a nation, but interference to effect what evangelical people called conversion was fanaticism and madness. He could not understand how any one brought up in the Church of England or Scotland, baptised and admitted to Church ordinances, could be said after that to come to the knowledge of Christ. They were already Christians, and could not be divided into converted and unconverted.

The rapid increase of 'Methodists,' in the beginning of the century, provoked men like Sydney Smith to say bitter things against them. They were forming a powerful party in the legislature. They had got into the army and navy, they were buying up the small livings, introducing into the Church 'nonsense, melancholy, and madness,' and making 'incursions on the happiness and common sense of the vicarage.' The Methodist and Evangelical missionaries were 'a nest of consecrated cobblers.' They were 'nasty and numerous.' They had been treated with ridicule and complained of the treatment, but 'vermin' always objected to the particular weapon by which they were destroyed. The subject was resumed in an article on Hannah More, one of those responsible for 'the trash and folly of Methodism.' It was, however, seriously proposed that the clergy should be taught to imitate the earnestness of these preachers, and if the evil could not be stopped, to revise the articles of religion, and admit a greater variety of Christians into the National Church.¹

Sydney liked the Puseyites no better than he liked the Methodists. He wrote in answer to 'What is a Puseyite?' the verses often quoted—

'He's great in *punctilios* when he bows and when he stands,
In the cutting of his surplice and the hemming of his bands,
But hark, with what a nasal twang between a whine and a groan
He doth our noble Liturgy most murderously intone.'

Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of St David's, was not identified with any new thought in theology, but his judgment or the action he took in relation to the events or movements of his

¹ See Articles in *Edinburgh Review*.

time ought to be recorded. He advocated the admission of Jews to Parliament¹ and in Ireland concurrent endowment instead of the disestablishment of the Irish Church.² Before he was ordained he had translated Schleiermacher's Introduction to St Luke's Gospel, and to some extent was supposed to be committed to the liberal theology of Germany. He regretted the increase of non-conformity in Wales, but admitted that it had made a salutary change in the moral and religious condition of the people. He did not regard the Oxford Tracts as an unmitigated evil. They had created a new life in the Church, and incited many active minds to the study of theology. The dispute about justification raised by Newman he called a mere conflict about words. The Tractarian doctrine of the Sacraments was extravagant, but it involved no questions of principle. Apostolical succession was not a pure novelty. It had been believed by many of the most eminent of our divines, and care had always been taken that it should not be interrupted. Thirlwall's judgment of Newman's secession was that he had conferred a greater benefit on the cause he had abandoned than on that which he had espoused.³ The argument from development was a confession that Scripture and tradition are not sufficient evidence for the Church of Rome. Baptism was explained not as an inward change but as being brought into a covenant relation. Regeneration was the same as conversion. The Athanasian creed was treated as it had been by Jeremy Taylor, whose objections to the damnatory clauses were endorsed, and all attempts to mitigate or explain away their meaning were declared to be futile. The State education of children was advocated on the ground that the State was not necessarily evil or unholy. On the same ground the propriety of appealing to a civil tribunal in matters ecclesiastical was justified. This did not imply that a civil court had any authority on controversies of faith.⁴ Dean Stanley used to call Thirlwall the 'sagacious' in the same sense that Hooker was the 'judicious.'

John McLeod Campbell, minister of Row, might have been noticed in connection with Thomas Erskine. He was deposed from his ministry by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1831. His heresy was that he taught universal atonement, universal pardon, and that assurance was of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation. He was a devoted pastor who asked

¹ Charge of 1848.

³ Charge of 1848.

² Charge of 1867.

⁴ Charge of 1859.

all his parishioners the personal question, if they were born again, and exhorted them to realise that they were forgiven. In his defence he maintained that the Confession of Faith was not meant to be final but was always subject to appeal to the Scriptures. He further argued that the doctrine of the Church of Rome was that Christ died for all men and that against this doctrine there was no protest in Protestant Confessions. The Westminster Assembly had as the basis of their deliberations, the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England and though the Westminster Confession did not teach the doctrine of universal atonement it was not denied. The genuine Calvinistic doctrine was an atonement limited to the elect. A price was paid for them and for no other. If this was not directly taught in the Assembly's Confession it was the ordinary doctrine and implied in the Calvinistic idea of election. Campbell taught that the atonement was not substitution, not a bearing by Christ of the punishment of sin, not a reconciliation of God to man. God was reconciled and gave His Son. He provided the sacrifice. It was the outward expression of the Divine love. Forty years after Campbell was deposed, representatives of all the principal churches in Scotland made him a public presentation in acknowledgment of their high estimate of his labours as a Theologian, expressing their regret that he had ever ceased to be a minister of the Church of Scotland.

Blanco White might have been noticed under Unitarianism. He was a native of Spain, and the son of very devout Roman Catholic parents. From his childhood his mother intended him to be a priest. His ardent intellect took delight in the studies necessary for this office, but for the office itself his wayward genius had but little inclination. He early showed a dislike to the Mass, which he called a nuisance, but it was 'over in half-an-hour.' Confession was a 'more serious annoyance,' but it was only 'a weekly task.' Of the lives, morals, and religious institutions of his native country he had no high appreciation. A nunnery was pure and poetical in a sermon, but the nunnery as it really existed 'was a byword for weakness of intellect, fretfulness, childishness.' The religious orders he called 'the well spring of ignorance and mental slavery.' After recording the conduct of a priest whom he had introduced to his family, he pronounced celibacy the most wicked and mischievous part of the Romish system. He had made the acquaintance of some priests who had ceased to believe in Christianity. One of them gave him access to his library where he found Mirabaud's *Système de la Nature*, and other French works of a similar character. The result was that he abjured Christianity,

left his native country, and came to England. After a reconsideration of the gospel, not as a dogmatic system, but in its spirit and tendencies as taught by Christ and His first apostles, he returned to the Christian faith. He was admitted to the Church of England, giving a provisional assent to the dogmatic system of the Prayer Book. In course of time he concluded that much which he found there was untenable. The spirit of it was controversial. This pervaded even the service for baptism. It had the scholastic view of original sin and of the Sacraments. He found the Liturgy too long, and not adapted for the instruction of the uneducated. To quote his own words, 'The attention recoils from the verbal forms so often heard, from speeches addressed in a tone of voice dissimilar to that of social or ordinary intercourse.' The sermon follows, then the sacrament in which there is such a 'superstitious adherence to the rubric as makes the service quite oppressive.' He had left the Church of Rome because the infallible authority on which the dogmas rested had failed. In England he found the authority on which Protestants rested their dogmas also failed. The Bible was not infallible. The words were certainly not dictated by God. He may have put thoughts into the minds of the writers, but this supposition was not applicable to the occasional writings of the Bible. There is not the slightest indication that the writers meant them as a rule of faith for all future ages. From this the conclusion was that if God had intended the Bible for an infallible creed, He would not have left this in conjecture and uncertainty. Hence it is inferred 'there exists no authority divinely appointed to settle the dogmatic questions which divide the Christian world.'

With this rapid development Blanco White found the Church of England 'a gourd which fades in the night.' He became a Unitarian, and found himself far from the spirit of religion or what is expressed by the Greek word *θρησκία*. He was no longer a slave to authority, but an independent thinker who takes all arguments at their actual value. Men believe that God is almighty, but there is no evidence for this belief so long as He cannot overcome evil. Revelation gives us the Man who is one with God struggling against evil. Blanco White's final opinions are found in his 'Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy.' Protestantism is untenable as the basis of orthodoxy. If saving faith is a belief in a certain system of propositions, there must be an infallible judge. It must be known where truth is to be found. But the Gospel does not consist in propositions. What is necessary to salvation is a change from the love of sin to the love of God. To

substitute propositions is to preach another gospel. The tendency of the human mind is either to embrace any supernatural or indiscriminate system of faith or to dismiss the subject as totally unworthy of attention. The gospel is the moral image of Christ, which if presented to the ignorant or even to savages in whom the seeds of morality are beginning to be developed, will be received. It is not creeds and propositions, not hard doctrines to be believed, but a life to be lived in imitation of Christ. When dying he said 'God to me is Jesus and remains God but not in the sense of the divines.'¹

Cardinal Wiseman ought to be noticed if only as the instrument of Newman's conversion and for the influence he had on the Roman Catholic community in England. As an Ultramontane and an advocate of the Church of Rome we know beforehand what kind of theology to expect. He had no arguments beyond those with which we are familiar. In his discourses on religion in relation to science he was not advanced, but followed the general track of orthodox Protestants. The Mosaic account of the dispersion he found to be confirmed by comparative philology. The native Americans had vivid traditions of man's early history, in which the records of the flood and the dispersion agreed with those of the old world, and these were such as must overcome all hesitation as to their origin. The mystery of Redemption rests on the belief that all have sinned in their common father. If this be not the case the Christian doctrines of sin and redemption fall to the ground. But as far as philology is concerned, the evidence is complete that, in the words of the sacred penman, all were 'of one lip and one speech.' As to geology, many things taken as facts that seemed to conflict with the record in Genesis are now found not to be facts. There is a pause between the first fiat of creation and the production of light. But more than this the participial form of the verb by which the Spirit of God is represented as brooding over the abyss, naturally expresses a continuous not a passing action. The very order of creation shows that the divine power loved to manifest itself by gradual development. Many of the Fathers interpreted the days as indefinite periods, but this is not absolutely required. Recent discoveries tend to confirm the truth of the sacred record. Geology points to a deluge such as the Scriptures describe. It is added that mythology points to unity of race, and that profane chronology does not go higher than that of the Scriptures.

¹ Life by Thom, vol. iii, 310.

Harriet Martineau was educated in the Unitarian faith but finally developed into the pure antithesis of a Theist. At an early age she gained prizes offered by the Unitarian Association for Essays to present Unitarianism to the notice of Roman Catholics, Jews and Mahommedans. These were written from the old stand-point of Unitarian orthodoxy, that the Unity of God as opposed to the Trinity is revealed in Scripture, and that Revelation is confirmed by miracle and prophecy.

For some years she was confined to a sick-room when she wrote 'Essays by an Invalid.' These were full of devout Christian sentiments, seeing in all that happened a God who cares and works for man, that good is eternal, evil transient, and that pain is the chastening of a Father in heaven.

After attaining some reputation as a writer on social and moral questions, Harriet Martineau bounded from old Unitarianism to what she called free Christianity, and described the Unitarians as people whose 'natural sense revolted against the essential points of Christian doctrine, while they had not learning enough, biblical, ecclesiastical, historical or philosophical to discover that what they gave up was truly essential, and that the name of Christian was a mere sham when applied to what was retained.'² The Unitarians described as 'nonsense' the doctrine of the Trinity, or Three in One, but it did seem strange that of the whole Christian world, only these few people saw the 'nonsense.' The Unitarians believe they have a revelation from God, and yet take any liberty with it they like. They had even an 'Improved' Bible in which large portions of the received Bible were set aside as spurious. Every Unitarian was at liberty to make the Scriptures mean what suited his own views.² To make the Epistles of St Paul teach Unitarian theology required the 'ingenuity of a Belsham.'

From free Christianity, Harriet Martineau passed by rapid strides to the final goal. She wrote that in what she had said in her 'Essays by an Invalid,' she had not dealt truly with her reason but was unconsciously trying to give strength of conviction by vigour of assertion.³ An appeal to the example of God for principles of justice and mercy was useless. The cruelty and injustice of 'divine government' were everywhere apparent. It might be that man did not understand the scheme of the universe, but no revelation could set us right on these matters for we have no faculty to understand anything 'beyond human ken.'

¹ Autobiography, vol. i., p. 37.

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 187.

This Agnosticism increased till all faith disappeared. In conjunction with a friend of the name of George Henry Atkinson, she published a book on the 'Laws of Man's Nature and Development.' It consisted of Letters which had passed between the writers in which they each expressed their opinions on such subjects as God and Nature. Atkinson was not only a materialist but a believer in Mesmerism and phrenology, which he regarded as sciences that confirmed the doctrines of materialism, in other words, proved absolutely that mind is merely a product of matter and will vanish with the dissolution of the organic body. Atkinson said that he was not an Atheist. He did not know enough to be able to say there was no God. A Cause of causes is an unfathomable mystery, and to imagine such a Cause to be a person is both 'extravagant and irreverent.'¹

The book was reviewed by James Martineau, who treated it with sarcasm and ridicule. The review is entitled 'Mesmeric Atheism,' and Harriet Martineau was recommended to teach George Henry Atkinson grammar in return for his lessons in science. The doctrine of the book is summed up as teaching that organisation must be before intelligence, and that all things are governed by a blind inscrutable fate, that free will is delusion, and that all distinction between right and wrong disappear. 'With grief,' the reviewer wrote, 'we must say that we remember nothing more melancholy in literary history than that Harriet Martineau should prostrate at the feet of such a master, and should lay down at his bidding her early faith in moral obligation, in the living God, in the immortal sanctities.'²

The criticism did not convince. Harriet Martineau dying, said, 'I neither wish to live longer here nor to find life elsewhere. It seems to me simply absurd to expect it. There is not only a total absence of evidence of a renewed life for human beings but so clear a way of accounting for the conception that I myself utterly disbelieve in a future life.'

¹ p. 240.

² *Prospective Review*, vol. vii.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER III

THE STATE OF RELIGION

THE Church in the beginning of the century does not seem to have been in a very prosperous condition. This is witnessed by the lamentations of friends and the exultations, it may be, the exaggerations of enemies. The services were ill attended and the fabrics were fast falling to decay.¹ One who wrote in defence of the Church said that he remembered a time when heads of families with their children and servants appeared in Church occupying whole pews, now it was common to see only a few members of the family present, it might be mothers, daughters and younger children, but fathers and sons were invariably absent. In St Paul's Cathedral where the clergy were numerous, efforts were made to render the services attractive. There was exquisite music by professional singers, but the seats were rarely half occupied. The population of London was reckoned at nearly a million, but of the working people not one in a thousand attended either church or meeting.² A writer in the *Evangelical Magazine*³ said that he believed all the magnificent churches in London did not habitually contain a number equal to that which assembled in Methodist and Dissenting meeting houses, and in Wales he understood that the disproportion was immense. The morality of the people corresponded to their neglect of religion. The Archdeacon of Ely, speaking of that diocese described the villagers as remarkably stupid, perverse and ignorant, the mechanics in the towns as debased and ill-

¹ See *British Critic*, vol. x, 319, and a pamphlet 'Considerations on the Present State of Religion, 1801.'

² 'Zeal without Innovation,' M. B. M. Cat, ascribed to J. Bean.

³ 1808, in a Review of Daubeny.

mannered, and the children of both as brought up in ignorance, rudeness and irreligion.¹ In London the working people spent Sunday in idleness, appearing in the streets in their working clothes and with the haggard look that debauch had left on their features. The higher class were much in the same condition, allowing for the different circumstances. There were fashionable parts where the Sunday did not begin till the morning service was nearly over. The noon was spent in the parks, and the rest of the day in pleasure. The middle class were no better than the others. The Sunday was a day of conviviality, generally spent in the country. The servants who imitated their employers generally return home just in time to open the doors.³ Sir Richard Hill in his place in Parliament proposed a double toll at turnpikes on Sunday with a view to checking Sunday travelling, which equalled if it did not exceed that on other days.³ Bishop Horsley in a sermon on the Sabbath probably recording his experiences when Rector of Newington said: 'In the country the roads are crowded on Sunday as on any other day with travellers of every sort. The devotion of the villagers is interrupted by the noise of the carriages passing through or stopping at the inns for refreshment. In the metropolis instead of the solemn stillness of the vacant streets, which might suit, as in our fathers' days, with the sanctity of the day, the mingled racket of worldly business or pleasure is going on with little abatement, and in the churches and chapels which adjoin the public streets, the sharp rattle of the whirling phaeton and the graver rumbling of the loaded waggon mixed with the oaths and imprecations of the drivers, distract the congregation and stem the voice of the preacher.'

Church reformers, both those who were friends and those who were enemies did not fail to set forth the deficiencies of the clergy and the anomalies in the ecclesiastical constitution. It is to be hoped that the pictures were often overdrawn. The clergy are spoken of as indolent, as following secular pursuits and as devoted to pleasure, taking more delight in a horse race, a fox chase or a boxing-match than in the services of religion. One clergyman generally served two or three parishes, galloped on Sunday from one to another, and sometimes accomplished the feat of compressing the whole service, sermon and all, into three-quarters of an hour.⁴

¹ Charge of Richard Watson, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff.

² See 'Zeal without Innovation.'

³ See Life by Sydney, 354.

⁴ See 'Letters to Percival' on the state of the Church, 1812. In the parish of which the writer of this is Vicar there are traditions to the same

The evils of the Church were generally traced to pluralities and non-residence. Pluralities were of two kinds; the first when two or three large benefices were held by one man, the second when the income was so small that a clergyman could not live on it. The evil was said to have begun with the Norman priests, who took the emoluments of a benefice and paid a Saxon to do the duty. Residence was made compulsory in the time of Henry VIII, but the law fell into abeyance. A writer who professed himself to be a friend of the Church ascribed the ignorance and immorality of the people more to pluralities than to infidel or immoral publications.¹ Pluralities, moreover, introduced into the Church an artificial poverty, and so a race of clergy of humble attainments.²

The Evangelical party were making progress but it was said of them that they were either already schismatics or on the way to schism. They were the lukewarm friends who made a league between the Church and the meeting. To get 'gospel preachers they buy advowsons, secure lectureships, and educate young men at the universities.' They hold prayer meetings which are illegal, as the clergy are 'limited by law to the services of the Church and the visitation of the sick.'³

The Evangelical clergy complained that in the Church everything was tolerated except earnestness. The liberal churchman, too, had occasion to lament that his day was apparently gone. A reviewer⁴ said, 'The most disastrous events in the political world have excited in almost every heart, such a dread of innovation that every attempt to reform what is allowed to be erroneous or to improve what is allowed to be defective is beheld with suspicion and terror. The fear of anarchy and suffering has made every abuse whether civil or ecclesiastical tolerable, and every burden by whomsoever imposed, comparatively light.

effect. On Sunday towards service time, the clerk went to the top of the tower, if he saw a clergyman in the distance on horseback at full speed he rung the bell and the people knew there was to be service. One clergyman used to bring a ferret in his pocket and do a little rabbit-catching after the service. On one occasion the ferret escaped from his pocket and walked down the aisle of the church, to the great amusement of the congregation.

¹ See a pamphlet 'The Necessity of the Abolition of Pluralities and Non-residence,' 1803.

² The writer of a pamphlet called 'Ecclesiastical Dignities, Ecclesiastical Grievances,' made a tour through England to see how the bishops spent their time, and at one Episcopal palace he found a company dancing to the tune of 'The devil among the tailors.'

³ See a pamphlet 'Unity the Bond of Peace.'

⁴ Aikin, *Annual Review*, 1804.

Meetings at the Feathers' Tavern to obtain the redress of ecclesiastical grievances have given place to meetings to secure the lives and property of peaceful citizens from the apprehended danger of domestic and foreign foes or to devise the most satisfactory means of opposing an invading army. The question concerning subscription to articles of religion no longer respects the right to enforce them or the propriety of submitting to their authority, but the due sense of the creed which is confessed and the principles which the conscientious subscribers ought to avow. The fear of Popery is succeeded by the fear of Methodism and much of the jealousy with which Papists were watched is transferred to those who endeavour to explain the doctrines of the Established Church by those of the holy Bishop of Hippo or the learned Reformer of Geneva.' Another reviewer after saying that Archdeacon Blackburne's work had never received a satisfactory answer, added this, 'though the fact so unquestionably be so, its enemies now enjoy the satisfaction of seeing that once formidable production completely neglected and the age indisposed to lend any countenance to its principles.'¹

Some persons took a brighter view of the Church and its prospects. They regarded those dark colourings as misrepresentations and the work of enemies. The preacher of a visitation sermon in the diocese of Winchester stoutly denied² what many had affirmed that we were all hastening to the condition of old Rome. Some had said that there was a growing indifference to all religion and a general desertion of outward forms and positive institutions. This was called a strong statement exceeding the bounds of truth. The satirists and declaimers of a hundred years ago, had indulged in the same excess of exaggeration. It was a fact that country churches were always well attended. In the rich and overgrown metropolis where doubtless there was luxury, refined sensuality and multiplied inducements to vice, the external appearance was often reprehensible. Yet never before was there to be found so much real piety and solid virtue.

The author of the pamphlet 'Pluralities and Non-Residence,' had a valiant opponent in the author of 'Anguis in Herba.'¹ The mere title indicates the suspicion that unworthy motives had led to exaggeration. This writer was conservative, he defended the Church, even denying that any reforms were necessary

¹ *Monthly Review*, vol. 47, 1805.

² Dr John Duncan, Visitation of Brownlow North, 1788.

¹ The author was James Hook afterwards Dean of Worcester, father of Dean Hook of Chichester.

or that there were any abuses to be corrected. The tract was dedicated 'to the sober sense of the country,' and the writer said jocularly that as in old times, geese had saved the Capitol by their cackling, he hoped to raise an alarm against the mischievous principles of some of their descendants. He complained that the law had been put in force to compel the clergy to reside on their benefices. This was often a great inconvenience and a perversion of the act of Henry VIII, and was due no doubt to the Jacobins who 'aspersed the Church and maligned the clergy.' It was no longer true that the evil in the Church exceeded the good. Pluralities were the right remedy for Ecclesiastical poverty. They were a necessity so long as two-thirds of the benefices were under one hundred pounds a year. The curates might be underpaid but they were not such ignorant dunces as they had been represented. They were all men with degrees from the universities and in scholarship were quite equal to those who held preferment. It was admitted that in the beginning of the previous century the churches were deserted, but now there was an entire change. In the metropolis and all large towns, the parish churches were crowded. There were also chapels of ease which could 'boast full and respectable auditories.' The progress during the previous sixty years had been great. No one could now say that there was 'indecorous attention to religious duties' or 'the semblance of piety to cover the worship of vanity.' The women no longer made the House of God 'the warehouse of fashion, nor the temple of the Creator the place of assignation.' With the progress of the times even the bishops had progressed, they were now 'a hierarchy whom the bitterest of their enemies did not dare to censure.'

It is much to be wished that this picture of the halcyon days of the Church in the beginning of the century could be confirmed. The majority of the witnesses it is to be feared sanction the other side. Bishop Porteus found among the lower classes, the same principles which in France led to the Revolution. The arguments of the old Deists had been adapted to the meanest capacity so 'that irreligion was made easy.'¹ The condition of the people in some places was 'little short of Pagan ignorance.'² The *British Critic* described the beginning of the century as marked by faction and impiety when the Church and the constitution had scarcely any public advocates.³

A semi-official document setting forth the state of religion in

¹ Charge of 1794

² Charge of 1803.

³ Vol. vi. Preface.

seventy-nine parishes in the diocese of Lincoln may be taken as fairly representing the state of the Church generally and the attitude of the clergy.¹ The adult attendance at church is put down as less than one in three and the communicants less than one in six. But there is a darker part of the picture. In times of sickness, it was a rare thing to send for the clergy. Parents and masters were remiss in sending their children and servants to church. Family prayer and Scripture reading were little known, and Sunday Schools had been a failure.

The Lincolnshire clergy were alarmed, not merely at the immorality of the people and their neglect of religious duties, but at the rapid increase of the Methodists. The influence of the old Nonconformists was gone. There were a few congregations of Baptists, Independents and Quakers, but they led quiet and peaceable lives and had no zeal. They troubled nobody, showed no asperity towards the clergy, and behaved with great decency. The meaning of this probably is, that they had no disposition to make proselytes. Altogether different was the character of the Methodists. They were everywhere aggressive. In these seventy-nine parishes, they already had thirty-eight meeting-houses and how to deal with them was a perplexing problem. The old Dissenters avowed their Nonconformity, but one class at least of the Methodists, actually attended Church and took the sacrament, yet when there was no Church service, they were in the meeting-house.² A second class of Methodists were more persistent in the way of transgression. They only attended meeting. A third class is described as 'encouraging a wandering tribe of fanatic preachers, who practise exorcisms and other impostures.' What kind of exorcisms they practised we are unfortunately not told. In a detailed account of these three classes, it is regretted that the first who professed to be Church people are compelled to license their meeting-houses as Dissenters which involved a species of prevarication. The second class are simply woeful Schismatics for whom there is no apology. They preached predestination and antinomianism which led to the despising of religion and neglect of worship. They used their meetings for purposes injurious to Church and State. It is diffi-

¹ A report made by the Clergy of Lincolnshire, 1800.

² To the Churchmen of the present day, these appear simply people craving for more services, and as such should have been dealt with. In the life of Richard Watson, a famous Wesleyan preacher, it is recorded that his grandmother daily attended Cathedral service and went to meeting when there was no Church service.

cult to determine what class of Methodists is here intended. Those of Lincolnshire were mainly followers of Wesley, who were neither Predestinarians, Antinomians, nor Republicans. The third class was even more abandoned than the second. They were destitute of 'all decency and shame.' They vilified the clergy and followed 'a strange delusion.' It is gratifying to find in this document that the clergy confess their own sins of omission which may have contributed to the evils they deplored. They resolved to increase their diligence in the performance of their duties, to promote domestic worship among their people, to persuade them to indulge less in worldly pursuits and to be more regular in their attendance at the public services of religion. Meetings for worship were to be held in addition to those in the Church, and it is reckoned desirable that some systematic plan should be adopted for the education of the children of the poor.

The condition of the agricultural population seems to have been very bad. The ale houses were open at all hours and on all days. Sunday was generally spent in dissipation. It was a common day for markets and the great day for 'feasts' and 'wakes.'

The Church's enemies at this time were the world, the flesh, the devil and the Methodists. The writer of a pamphlet already quoted, spoke of the 'increasing desertion of the parish churches in many parts of the kingdom, chiefly owing to the labours of the Methodists and the unwearied assiduity of their numerous itinerant preachers.' But under the designation of Methodists was generally included the Evangelical or Calvinistic clergy. A reviewer who professed attachment to the Church of England, but who was probably a peaceable descendant of old Nonconformity, wrote thus 'A worse danger than the spirit of Methodism can scarcely be apprehended for England.'¹ He had reviewed the history in its rise and progress and exclaimed 'Let the Church look to it or the sequel will be the history of its decline and fall.' He recommended more zeal. To those who objected that this would change the establishment, he answered that 'if it did not reform itself from within, it would be reformed from without with a vengeance,' adding 'There is yet time for it to make its choice between reformation and ruin.'

The Church had other troubles besides those which arose from the progress of the Methodists. There was an uncertainty in the value of tithes, and the consequence was continual collisions

¹ Aikin's Annual Review, Art. Ingram's History of the Methodists.

between the clergy and their parishioners. The burden of one-tenth of the produce of the land was an old grievance, older than the time of the Reformation. Statutes passed in the time of Henry VIII show how the farmers complained of the burden, and speak of efforts to lighten it. When the property of the monasteries was confiscated and alienated from ecclesiastical uses, this was one of the subjects reserved for the 'thirty-two persons who were to inquire into Church canons and constitutions.' The inquiry was never made. The Church after the Reformation was miserably poor, and it was added to the hardships of the clergy, that they had to exact their slender incomes from farmers as poor if not poorer than themselves. In the time of Queen Elizabeth, four thousand four hundred benefices had not over ten pounds a year, and the majority were not more than eight. In the time of Charles I, when there was an outcry about 'scandalous ministers,' a Member of Parliament said that there were 'scandalous livings as well as scandalous ministers.'¹

The tithe question was never in abeyance, but it was never more agitated than about the beginning of this century and the end of the last. The science, capital, and industry of the farmer had improved the soil. The tithe owner was reaping an unearned increment. The strife continued through the first three decades of the century. In 1836 fortunately for the Church, a commutation was made. It had been long opposed by many of the bishops and clergy, but now it was seen to be a necessity. The only bishop who finally held out against it was Henry of Exeter.²

¹ Sir Benjamin Rudyard.

² There is a continuous literature on the tithe question since the Reformation, very plentiful in the time of the Commonwealth, when some wished to escape paying tithes because they would not pay to Puritans. The collisions between the farmers and clergy are amusingly described by Cowper. It is tithe rent day. The parson sits in the Vicarage trembling. The poet says—

‘And well he may,
Each bumpkin of the clan
Instead of paying what he owes,
Will cheat him if he can.

One talks of mildew and of frost,
And one of showers of hail,
And one of pigs that he has lost,
By maggots at the tail.

Oh, why were farmers made so coarse,
Or clergy made so fine?
A kick that scarce would move a horse,
May kill a sound divine.

Then let the boobies stay at home ;
'Twould cost him, I dare say,
Less trouble taking twice the sum,
Without the clowns that pay.'

In Kent, the cultivation of hops raised enormously the value of tithes. The farmers sometimes offered as much as they paid for rent, but the tithe owner sometimes exacted the tenth of the hops after they were picked. The Rector of Kensington put a heavy imposition on pine apples grown in green houses, and the Vicar of Battersea found tithe in kind so profitable that he engaged a man to hawk garden produce, shouting through the streets 'Asparagus and cauliflowers.'¹ John Middleton said, 'Had tithes never been established, happy would it have been for the country and still more so for the clergy. They are a powerful cause of many quitting the Church, and of creating and supporting schism. They are the never-ending source of ill-will, quarrelling, and litigation, and are unquestionably one great cause of the continuance of so much common and uncultivated land in the kingdom.'

¹ See Report of Board of Agriculture, 1792.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER IV

BIOGRAPHIES

It has seemed desirable to add some brief notices of the chief writers who have been mentioned if sometimes only the birth and death. The order is alphabetical.

THOMAS ARNOLD was born at East Cowes in the Isle of Wight in 1795. He was educated at Winchester and at Corpus Christi, Oxford. In 1815, he was elected Fellow of Oriel. From 1820 to 1828 he lived at Laleham near Staines, taking private pupils. In 1828, he was elected Master of Rugby. An article written by him in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1836 called the 'Oxford Malignants,' that is the men who wished to keep Hampden from the professorship of Divinity, made him many enemies. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Howley, objected to his preaching the Consecration Sermon when Bishop Stanley was consecrated. His great success at Rugby is well known. It reached its climax about 1840. In 1841, he was chosen Regius Professor of History at Oxford. He died in 1842. His life was written by Stanley his favourite pupil and his lineal successor as a liberal Churchman.

CHARLES BABBAGE was born at Teignmouth in 1792. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, which he entered in 1811. He was afterwards Laucasian Professor of Mathematics in the same university. He died in 1871.

JAMES ARTHUR BALFOUR was born in 1848, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. From 1878 to 1880 he was private

secretary to his uncle Lord Salisbury when Foreign Minister. In 1886 he was Secretary for Scotland.

SHUTE BARRINGTON, Bishop of Durham, was the sixth son of John Shute, Lord Barrington, a Presbyterian who defended and practised occasional conformity and was a zealous advocate of the rights of Nonconformists during the reign of Queen Anne. John Shute's mother was a daughter of Joseph Caryll, who in 1662 was ejected from St Magnus. He was the author of a ponderous commentary on the Book of Job. His father, Benjamin Shute, was a silk merchant in Ludgate Hill, whose sister married Francis Barrington, through whom John Shute inherited the property and took the title and arms of the Barringtons. The Bishop was born in 1734, seven months before his father's death. He was educated at Eton and at Merton College, Oxford, and ordained in 1756 by Secker. On the accession of George III he was made one of the chaplains-in-ordinary, and in 1761 Canon of Christ Church. This was followed in 1768 by a canonry in St Paul's, and in the year following he was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff. It was as Bishop of Llandaff that he opposed the petition for the abolition of subscription to the Articles of Religion. His biographer defended him as not wanting in allegiance to the tolerant principles of his father, but as simply preventing the preferments of the Church being left open to Arians, Socinians, or indefinite Christians of any kind. In 1781 Barrington was translated to Salisbury. He immediately restored the Cathedral. In 1791 he was translated to Durham. In 1801 he delivered a Charge on the French Revolution, and the connection between infidelity and Romanism. The Bishop, though a strong Protestant, was a bountiful friend to the French clergy driven from their country by the Revolution. He died in 1826.¹

HENRY BATHURST was born 1744. He was the seventh son of the first Earl Bathurst, and was educated at Winchester and at New College, Oxford. In 1775 he was made a Canon of Christ Church, in 1795 Prebendary of Durham. In 1805 he was consecrated Bishop of Norwich. He is said to have been the only liberal Bishop in the House of Lords. Died 1837.

THOMAS BELSHAM was born at Bedford in 1756. For three years he was pastor of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters in

¹ See Annual Obituary for 1827.

Worcester. In 1781 he was appointed Principal of the Academy at Daventry where he had been educated. This office he relinquished on giving up the Calvinistic faith for that of the Unitarians, and was placed at the head of their new college at Hackney. He succeeded Priestley as preacher to the Gravel Pit congregation. He was afterwards minister of Essex Street. He died in 1819.

JEREMY BENTHAM was born in 1748 and educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He studied for the law but abandoned that as a profession. He wrote much on politics and jurisprudence. His system of morals was Utilitarian. He had no religious element in his constitution. Died in 1832.

CHRISTOPHER BETHELL was born in 1773, and educated at King's College Cambridge. In 1814 he was made Dean of Chichester, in 1820 Prebendary of Exeter, in 1824 Bishop of Gloucester, transferred to Exeter in 1830 and in the same year to Bangor. He died in 1859.

THOMAS RAWSON BIRKS was born in 1810. He was a Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge. In 1844 Rector of Kelshall, in 1866 Incumbent of Trinity Church, Cambridge, in 1871 Canon of Ely, and in 1872 succeeded Maurice as Professor of Moral Philosophy in Cambridge. He might have been mentioned with those who wrote against 'Essays and Reviews,' 'Supernatural Religion,' and such books, but his arguments are all of the most orthodox kind with which most people are quite familiar. He died in 1883.

EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE was born in 1811 and educated at Eton and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He was Fellow of his College and in 1841 Rector of St Sidwell's, Exeter. From 1843 to 1849 he was Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in Lampeter College. Then Norrisian Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, in 1864 Bishop of Ely, and in 1873 he was transferred to Winchester. Died in 1891.

WILLIAM BUCKLAND was born in 1784. In 1808, he was elected a Fellow of Corpus Christi, Oxford; in 1813 Professor of Mineralogy, in 1845 he was appointed Dean of Westminster. Died in 1856.

THOMAS BURGESS was born in 1756. He was the son of a

village grocer in Hampshire. He was educated at Winchester, and Corpus Christi, Oxford, of which college he was elected a Fellow in 1783. In 1785 he was examining chaplain to Shute Barrington, Bishop of Salisbury, and accompanied him to Durham where he was made a Prebendary. In 1803 he was consecrated Bishop of St David's. He founded the College of Lampeter, and did much for the ecclesiastical and educational improvement, not only of his diocese but of the whole of Wales. He was translated to Salisbury in 1825, and died in 1837.

JOHN WILLIAM BURGON was born in 1813, and was educated at Worcester College, Oxford. From 1863 to 1876 he was Vicar of St Mary the Virgin, in Oxford. In 1876 he was made Dean of Chichester. He was noted as the redoubted champion of literal verbal inspiration, not yielding one inch of ground to those who differed from him. His biographer, Dean Goulbourn says, 'Burgon was in this country the leading teacher of his time, who brought all the resources of genius and profound theological learning to refute the encroachments of Rationalism.' He died 1888.

CHARLES BUTLER was born in 1750 and educated at Douay. In 1775 he was entered at Lincoln's Inn. After the act for the relief of Roman Catholics he was called to the bar, and was the first Roman Catholic Barrister since 1688. He was Secretary to the Liberal Party which called itself the 'Protesting Catholic Dissenters,' and was so little in favour with the other party that Dr Milner called him 'a decided enemy to the hierarchy of his Church.' To Dr Parr he once wrote, 'The chief aim of all my writings has been to put Catholics and Protestants into good humour with one another, and Catholics into good humour with themselves.' He died in 1832.

JOHN MCLEOD CAMPBELL was born at Kilmarnock in 1800, studied at the University of Glasgow, and died in 1872.

THOMAS CARLYLE was born at Ecclefechan in Dumfriesshire, in 1795. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, with the intention of becoming a Minister in the Church of Scotland. This was abandoned for a literary life. He first became famous as a contributor to the *Edinburgh Review*. He lived many years at Chelsea, and died in 1882.

THOMAS CHALMERS was born at Aulstruther in Fifeshire, in 1780, and was educated at the University of St Andrews. In 1803 he became minister of Kilmany in his native county. Through reading Wilberforce's 'Practical View,' and during the preparation of an article on Christianity for the 'Edinburgh Encyclopædia' he was led to think more seriously of his profession and became a pronounced Evangelical preacher. In 1815 he was called to the Tron Church of Glasgow and afterwards to St John's. He was called a Demosthenes for eloquence. When he preached in London Wilberforce wrote in his diary 'All the world wild about Chalmers,' after hearing him he wrote, 'I was surprised to see how greatly Canning was affected at times, he was quite melted into tears.' Chalmers wrote on many subjects, political, social, philosophical and theological. At St Andrews he was Professor of Moral Philosophy and at Edinburgh of Divinity. He had great influence over the students. His action against patronage led to the Disruption in the Church of Scotland. He advocated the principle of a State Church and that it was the duty of the State to build and endow Churches, but he wished the Church to be free. Since the Disruption the Established Church has found it necessary for its own existence to get rid of patronage. Chalmers died in 1847.

RICHARD WILLIAM CHURCH was born in 1815. He was distinguished as a student at Oxford, and an active though not a prominent worker in the Tractarian movement. He was made Dean of St Paul's in 1871, and died in 1891.

WILLIAM CLEAVER was the son of a clergyman who kept a school in the village of Twyford in Buckinghamshire. He was born in 1742, and had a younger brother called Euseby who became Archbishop of Dublin. The father had nothing to give his sons but Latin and Greek and with these added to industry and good conduct, they made their way to fame and fortune. William got a demyship at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1764, a fellowship at Brazenose. He had for his pupil the heir of the Grenvilles, afterwards Earl Temple and Marquis of Buckingham. The fellowship was given up for the living of Cottingham in Northamptonshire which was in the gift of the College. In 1782, when Earl Temple was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he took Cleaver with him as one of his chaplains. A new ministry caused Earl Temple to lose his Lieutenantship, when Cleaver returned to England and obtained the headship of

Brazenose. On the return of the Grenvilles to power, he was made a Prebendary of Westminster and in 1787 he succeeded Porteus in the see of Chester. In 1800 by the same influence he was translated to Bangor and after six years succeeded Horsley in St Asaph. With his bishopric he held the headship of his college and some other preferments, and was, his biographer says, 'in no small degree opulent.' He was a great enemy to the evangelical clergy and also to non-residence, though he himself resided but partially in his diocese for which he used to plead, 'his infirmities and other necessary avocations.' His charities are said to have been very extensive and he seems also to have been extensively orthodox. He was one of those who wrote against Bishop Marsh on the origin of the Synoptical Gospels. Died in 1815.¹

ADAM CLARKE was born in 1762 in the North of Ireland. He was mainly self-educated. In 1782, after a short time at Wesley's school in Kingswood, he was sent into Wiltshire as Methodist preacher. His great work was a commentary on the Bible. St Andrews University conferred on him the degree of LL.D. He died in 1832.

FRANCES POWER COBBE was born in 1822 in Ireland, and educated at Brighton. She wrote much on social, moral and theological subjects, on the rights of women and of brutes. She now lives in retirement in Wales.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO was born in 1814. He was educated at St John's College, Cambridge and came out as second wrangler. He was afterwards Fellow and Tutor of his College. He held the living of Fornsett St Mary's for eight years when in 1856 he was consecrated Bishop of Natal. In 1863 the Privy Council decided that the Bishop of Cape Town had no authority over him, so he retained his see. Died 1883.

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE was born in 1772 at Ottery St Mary's in Devonshire. He was educated at Christ's Hospital and in 1791 was entered at Jesus College Cambridge, which he left during the second year of his residence and enlisted under a feigned name as a private soldier. He was great as a poet and as a metaphysician. He died at Highgate in 1834.

¹ Annual Biography and Obituary for 1817.

WILLIAM JOHN CONYBEARE was born in 1813. He was educated at Winchester and at Trinity College, Cambridge of which he became a Fellow. In 1842 he was appointed the first Principal of the Liverpool Collegiate Institute. In conjunction with John S. Howson, his successor at Liverpool and afterwards Dean of Chester, he wrote 'The Life and Epistles of St Paul.' The Article in the *Edinburgh Review* on Church Parties went through many editions. Died in 1857.

EDWARD COPLESTON was born at Offwell, Devonshire, in 1776. He was made Fellow of Oriel in 1795, and Provost in 1814. In 1826, he was Dean of Chester, and in 1827, Bishop of Llandaff. He died in 1849.

CHARLES DARWIN was born at Shrewsbury in 1809. Died 1882.

JOHN DAVISON was born in 1777. He was entered at Christ Church in 1794, was made Fellow of Oriel in 1800, and Tutor in 1810. He was Vicar of Satterton, Lincolnshire, in 1817, and in 1818 of Washington, Durham. In 1826, he took the living of Upton upon Severn, and was made Prebendary of Worcester. Died in 1834. Dr Newman wrote an article on his life and character.

CHARLES DAUBENY was born at Bristol, where his father was a merchant, in 1744. He was sent to Winchester College, and after that he entered New College, Oxford. His health failing, he was advised to travel which he did for some years in various continental countries. On his return he was ordained deacon in 1773, by Bishop Law of Oxford, and in the following week, priest, by Bishop Terrick of London. In 1774, he obtained a fellowship at Winchester College, and two years later, he accepted the Vicarage of North Bradley. This was worth £50 a year. The parish is described as having fallen 'into dilapidation and disorder.' There was but one service on Sunday, and that was thinly attended. The sectaries abounded, and the people were wild and uncivilised. The first business was to restore the church, and rebuild the vicarage house. His sermons against schism roused the opposition of his parishioners, but they were the beginning of his literary work as a defender of the Church.

In 1784, Bishop Barrington conferred on Daubeny a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral, and in 1804, he was appointed Archdeacon by Bishop Douglas. Christ Church, Bath, was built largely

at his expense and by his exertion, as a free church for the poor. The 'Guide to the Church' was constructed out of the sermons against the sectaries preached at North Bradly. The Archdeacon's publications were numerous, but one line runs through them all,—attachment to the Church of England as a divine institution, and hatred of all non-episcopal Churches, as the devil's synagogues of human, if not of diabolical institution. He said that wherever God builds a church the devil builds a synagogue, that is, a Dissenting Chapel. William Wilberforce and Hannah More, his personal friends, were in his judgment with the party they represented, the dangerous enemies, though the professed friends, of the Church of England. The Archdeacon, when in Switzerland, was greatly shocked to see the Protestants standing during prayer. He made the pious remark that the primitive Christians were kneeling Christians. Probably his learning had not discovered that the first Christians stood on the first day of the week in honour of the resurrection. The Archdeacon was an earnest man, and much esteemed by those who agreed with him. To those who did not he was simply 'a bigot.' He died in 1827.¹

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON was born in 1805, was educated at Eton, and Christ Church, Oxford, of which he became Fellow in 1828. In 1845, he was collated to the Vicarage of East Brent. He was examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells. In 1851, Archdeacon of Taunton. Died in 1896.

CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT was born in 1818, was elected Fellow of St John's, Cambridge in 1851. In 1848 he was Professor of Divinity, in King's College, London, in 1861 Dean of Exeter and in 1863 Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

EDWARD BISHOP ELLIOT was born in 1793, and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he was made a Fellow in 1817. He was appointed Vicar of Tuxford in 1824, and in 1855 Incumbent of St Mark's, Brighton. He was an active and earnest clergyman of the Evangelical school and was highly appreciated by them as an interpreter of prophecy, at one time their favourite subject. He died in 1857.

THOMAS ERSKINE was born in 1788, was educated at the High

¹ Memoir prefixed to Works and Annual Biography for 1828.

School and the University of Edinburgh. In 1810 he was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates. As the heir of Linlathen, after his brother's death he was independent of his profession, and gave himself up entirely to questions of theology and the promotion of earnest religion. He was held in high esteem by a large circle of great and good men. Carlyle was a devoted friend, and Maurice might be called to some extent his disciple. He died in 1870.

GEORGE STANLEY FABER was born in 1773. He matriculated at University College, Oxford, in 1789. Bishop Barrington gave him several valuable livings in succession. Bishop Burgess gave him a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral, and in 1832 Van Mildert gave him the valuable appointment of Master of Sherburn Hospital. He died in 1854.

FREDERIC WILLIAM FARRAR was born at Bombay in 1831. He graduated B.A. at the University of London and in 1852 gained a University Scholarship. He was Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, Assistant Master of Harrow, and from 1871 to 1876 Master of Marlborough College. In 1876 he was made a Canon of Westminster, in 1883 Archdeacon, and in 1895 Dean of Canterbury.

ROBERT FELLOWES was born in 1771 and educated at St Mary's Hall, Oxford. He never had any preferment higher than that of Curate of Harbury in Warwickshire. From 1804 to 1811 he edited the *Critical Review*. Died 1847.

JOHN FOSTER was born in 1779 at Halifax. He left his original occupation of a weaver to become a preacher. He retired to Stapleton near Bristol where he devoted himself to literature. He was one of the chief writers in the *Eclectic Review*. Died 1843.

JAMES HATLEY FRERE was born in 1779. He seems to have been a gentleman of independent fortune who devoted his time to the study of prophecy. The Dictionary of National Biography says very little about him beyond a list of his publications. He died in 1866.

JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE was born at Dartington near Totnes in Devonshire in 1818, and educated at Westminster School, and Oriel College, Oxford. He was elected Fellow of Exeter College in 1842. He died in 1894.

RICHARD HURRELL FROUDE was born in 1803, was educated at Eton, and Oriel College, Oxford. He came under Newman's influence and was looking towards the Church of Rome as the ideal Church. But in 1832 when he went to the south of Europe for his health he was awfully shocked with the degeneracy of the Catholics in Italy. They were not such as he expected the members of the Holy Catholic Church to be. He died in 1836.

ALEXANDER GEDDES was born at Arrowdowl in the county of Banff in 1737, educated at a Roman Catholic Seminary in Scotland and at the Scotch College in Paris. For ten years he was a priest in the county of Banff. He was then suspended from his office for having gone to hear a minister in a Scotch Kirk. Died in London in 1802.

THOMAS GISBORNE was born in 1758 and entered St John's, Cambridge, in 1776. In 1783 he became Perpetual Curate of Barton under Needwood. In 1820 he was made a Prebendary of Durham. At College he made the friendship of Wilberforce who was a frequent guest at Yoxall Lodge, his ancestral residence, which was in the neighbourhood of his cure. He was a poet as well as a writer on moral and theological subjects. He belonged to the Evangelical party. Died in 1846.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE was born at Liverpool in 1809. He was educated at Eton, and Christ Church College, Oxford. He is great as a theologian as well as a politician, and had he been Archbishop of Canterbury he would have been as famous as he has been as Prime Minister.

WILLIAM GOODE was born in 1801, was educated at St Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1835 he became Rector of St Antholin's, and in 1849 of All Hallows, Thames Street, in 1850 of St Margaret's, Lothbury, and in 1860 Dean of Ripon. For many years he was Editor of the *Christian Observer* and a chief man among the Evangelical clergy. He wrote much on the Tractarian Controversy. Great scholars like Dean Milman note the accuracy of his quotations. He died in 1868.

GEORGE CORNELIUS GORHAM was born in 1787 at St Neots, in Hunts. He entered Queen's College, Cambridge in 1805. After a brilliant career as a student he was elected Fellow of his College. The Bishop of Ely, Thomas Dampier, not finding him sound on

Baptismal Regeneration hesitated to ordain him but he gave way. In 1846 he was inducted by Bishop Phillpotts to the living of St Just, in Cornwall, and the next year had a dispute with the Bishop about the nomination of a curate. In the same year he accepted from the Lord Chancellor the living of Brampford Speke. This was not half the value of St Just, but the duty was lighter and there were more facilities for the education of his family. The Bishop after putting him through 149 questions refused to institute. A suit followed in which Gorham ultimately had the victory. A public subscription was made to pay his legal expenses, and the surplus was used to present him with a magnificent silver tea service. He rebuilt and embellished Brampford Speke Church. Died in 1857.

WILLIAM RATHBONE GREG was born in 1809. He was educated among the Unitarians, For some time he managed his father's mills at Bury. Died in 1886.

ROBERT HALL was born in 1764. He was the son of a Baptist Minister, and is said to have preached at eleven years of age. In 1781 he went to King's College, Aberdeen, and took his degree of M.A. in 1784. His first engagement as preacher was as assistant to Dr Evans in Broadmead Chapel, Bristol. He there became famous for eloquence. In 1790 he succeeded Robinson at Cambridge. In 1806 he settled as Pastor of a Congregation at Leicester, and finally succeeded Dr Ryland at Bristol. Lord Brougham compared him as an orator to Massillon. He died in 1831.

RENN DICKSON HAMPDEN was born at Barbadoes in 1793. He was entered a commoner at Oriel in 1810 and in 1813 he gained a double first. After serving several curacies he returned to Oxford in 1829 and was Public Examiner. In 1832 he was Bampton Lecturer and soon after Tutor of Oriel. He was Professor of Moral Philosophy in 1834 and when it was proposed to make him Professor of Divinity, the storm arose. The 'Malignants' as Dr Arnold called them, wished to prevent the appointment, because he took the Scriptures as his authority, and not the Scholastic interpretation of the Scriptures. He was willing to yield to the clamour, but Lord Melbourne wrote 'For the sake of the principles of toleration and free inquiry we consider ourselves bound to persevere in your appointment.' In 1847 Lord John Russell nominated him to the see of Hereford when his enemies again

renewed their ancient griefs. Thirteen Bishops presented to the Prime Minister an address of remonstrance. His election was carried by the Chapter, the Dean and one of the Canons voting against him. After the election the world went on as quietly as before. Hampden was an excellent Bishop administering the affairs of his diocese for twenty years with great success. He died in 1868.

JULIUS CHARLES HARE born in 1789 was educated at Tunbridge School under Vicesimus Knox and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was Fellow of Trinity in 1818, Tutor in 1822, Rector of Hurstmonceux and Archdeacon of Chichester. Died in 1855.

THOMAS HAWEIS was born at Redruth and educated at Truro Grammar School. In 1755 he was entered at Christ Church, Oxford and afterwards became a Member of Magdalen Hall. He was removed from the curacy of St Mary Magdalen, Oxford, by Bishop Hume on account of his Methodist sympathies. He then became assistant to Martin Madan at the Lock Hospital. In 1764 he was presented to the Rectory of Aldwinkle. He was said to have taken it with letters of resignation, but when asked to resign he denied the letters. In 1768 he became Chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon and manager of her College at Trevecca in Wales. Died 1820.

EDWARD HAWKINS was born in 1789. In 1807 he was entered at St John's College, Oxford, Tutor in 1812, Fellow of Oriel in 1813, Tutor of Oriel in 1819, Vicar of St Mary's in 1823, Provost of Oriel in 1828. Died in 1882.

CHARLES CHRISTIAN HENNEL was born in 1800 and was brought up a Unitarian. In 1826 he began business in Threadneedle Street as a silk and drug merchant. His 'Inquiry' was undertaken for personal satisfaction and turned out different from what he expected. Having married a German lady, his work was introduced to Strauss who pronounced a high eulogium upon it. His wife in return undertook to translate the *Leben Jesu* but the work was transferred to Mary Ann Evans, that is George Eliot who is said to have been greatly interested in and influenced by Hennell's 'Inquiry.' Died 1850.

SARA SOPHIA HENNELL was born in 1817. She was the sister of Charles Hennell. Died in 1895.

SIR RICHARD HILL was the eldest son of Sir Rowland Hill. He was born at Hawkstone in 1733. The first important event of his life was his 'conversion.' This was not any change in the doctrines he had been taught, but a sensible illumination which made him feel that he was a new man. The record given by himself is the familiar story of the inward struggle, of alternations, of light and darkness, of temptation and victory, and finally light and peace all along the path of life. When eight or nine years of age, one Sunday evening while repeating his catechism at school, he had what he calls 'a transitory glimpse of the heavenly gift,' but he was not at once obedient to the heavenly vision. He had serious convictions but he waited a more convenient season to think of a decision. He had been for four or five years a scholar at Westminster when the time of his confirmation came. Now, he thought, was the opportunity to begin the new life, but he was assaulted with doubts about the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the truth of the Bible. He borrowed a copy of Beveridge's 'Private Thoughts,' and while reading them or hearing them read 'glorious instantaneous light and comfort were diffused over his soul.' This, too, was transient. He was entered at Magdalen College, Oxford, and afterwards went on foreign travel, but when he returned the struggle was still hot within him. He sought the advice of Fletcher, the Vicar of Madeley, who acted as his guide. One evening when preparing to receive the sacrament next day in the Chapel of Magdalen, he felt a peace and victory, the sense of which ever after remained with him. Sir Richard was the instrumental means of a similar change taking place in his brother Rowland who was then at Eton.

Sir Richard occasionally preached and when six students were expelled from St Edmund's Hall for preaching, praying and other Methodist practices, he undertook their defence in a publication called *Pietas Oxoniensis*. He again appeared as a controversialist in defence of Calvinistic doctrine, against the declaration of the Methodist Conference of 1770, when Wesley strongly condemned the doctrines of Calvin and warned his preachers of the danger of falling into Antinomianism. The language of this Conference has always been regarded as extreme and seeming to favour the doctrine of Pelagius. Fletcher said

that it was unguarded but he appeared as Wesley's defender. Sir Richard Hill took the other side.

In 1780 he was returned Member of Parliament for his native county of Shropshire. He was an independent member, taking side with neither Whig nor Tory but voting for measures according to their merit. He was a frequent speaker, always ready and full of humour. He promoted laws for the better observance of Sunday.

He often quoted Scripture in his speeches which caused the other members to laugh, but he would apologise with great pleasantry for quoting such an obsolete book as the Bible which took up so little of the time and attention of the Honourable House, who it appears were so godless that often no one but the Speaker was present at prayers. Besides the controversy with Daubeny, Sir Richard Hill wrote letters to Bishop Tomline concerning what the Bishop had said about Evangelical preaching and the increase of sectaries. He found the real cause of the increase of sectaries in the indifference of the clergy who drove away the flock from the Churches of which they were pastors. He proposed opening the doors of the Church wider and recommended that the bishops ordain men if qualified even though they had not the advantages of a University education, for many who became preachers in conventicles would take orders in the Church if they could obtain them. Sir Richard was one of the first promoters of the Bible Society. He died in 1808.¹

ROWLAND HILL was born in 1744, educated at Eton, and St John's, Cambridge, which he entered first as a pensioner, afterwards a fellow commoner. As he visited the sick and those in prison and belonged to a company of serious students, he was suspected of Methodism. Six bishops refused to ordain him. He never took more than deacon's orders. In Surrey Chapel he always used the Prayer Book and always declared himself no Dissenter but a true Churchman. He died in 1883.

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK was born in 1798, was educated at Winchester and at Christ Church Oxford. His great success was as Vicar of Leeds. He was appointed Vicar in 1837, and in 1841 a new church had to be built to contain the congregation. On an Easter Day there were sometimes 500 or 600 communicants which in the Church of England is reckoned a large number, though in Roman Catholic and Presbyterian countries that

¹ See Life by Sidney.

number would not be reckoned large for a country parish. In 1859 Hook was made Dean of Chichester. Died in 1879.

SAMUEL HORSLEY was born in 1733. His father was Rector of Newington and his grandfather had been a Nonconformist. He was educated at Westminster School and at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. In 1759, his father resigned in his favour the Rectory of Newington, which he held with the living of Albury. He was also chaplain to Bishop Lowth. In 1773 he was chosen Secretary of the Royal Society. He was afterwards Archdeacon of St Albans, and in 1782 Rector of South Weald in Essex. In 1788 he was raised to the see of St David's through the interest of Lord Thurlow. In 1790 he wrote anonymously 'A Review of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters' for which he was accused of illiberality and unfairness. In 1794 he was translated to Rochester which he held with the Deanery of Westminster. In 1802 he was translated to St Asaph. Besides his works on theology, he wrote on mathematics and other sciences. In politics he was an ardent supporter of Pitt. Bishop Horsley's Charges are very lively reading. They abound in gems of originality, in touches of humour and satire with frequent torrents of eloquence. In his Primary Charge as Bishop of Rochester, after exhorting his clergy to study Hebrew, Mathematics, Ethics, Metaphysics, History, Politics, Jurisprudence, he paused and then said, 'I must distinctly make exception of one study, if study it may be called, which has lately begun to come into credit with the younger clergy, which my imagination cannot in the remotest degree connect with the business of our profession, nor reconcile the pursuit of it with the good policy of a clergyman's conduct. It has become the practice among many of the younger clergy to shut up their books when they quit the university, and to think no more of literature sacred or profane. The practice is too manifest to be denied, for they who are to be found in every season of the year and at every hour of the day, in circles of dissipation—and every season and every hour has now its appropriate amusement—are not likely to be found at any time in their studies. Their defence is that, although they read but little, nothing indeed beyond a review or a magazine, they are engaged in a most edifying study. They tell us gravely they are *studying men*, and the knowledge of man. They say it is infinitely more useful than that of books.' Further on 'I will show no connivance to the non-residence of the younger clergy who absent themselves from their parishes for no better purpose

than to *study men* in the manner in which this delightful study is usually pursued by them.' Horsley died in 1806.

WILLIAM HOWLEY was born in 1766, was educated at New College, Oxford, made Bishop of London in 1813, and in 1828 Archbishop of Canterbury. Died in 1848.

THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY was born in 1825. His studies were chiefly in physiology and other natural sciences. He had been religiously educated, but what he wrote on theology was on the antagonistic side. He christened his non-belief by the name of Agnosticism. Died in 1895.

WILLIAM JOSIAH IRONS was born in 1812. He was the son of a congregational minister who was a popular evangelical preacher. He graduated from Queen's College, Oxford. From 1833 to 1837 he was Curate of St Mary's, Newington, in 1846 Vicar of Brompton, and in 1872 Rector of St Mary's, Woolnoth. Died in 1883.

EDWARD IRVING was born in 1793, and at the age of thirteen entered the University of Edinburgh. In 1812 he was appointed master of an academy in Kirkcaldy. Carlyle came to the same town at the same time to take charge of an opposition school. In 1819 Irving became assistant to Chalmers in St John's, Glasgow. In 1822 he came to the Scotch Chapel in Hatton Garden. Here he became famous, and a new church had to be built in Regent Square, but the great crowds ceased to follow him. He took up with the dealers in prophetic interpretations, reading the signs of the times with the eyes of Hatley Frere. Then his congregation began to speak with other 'tongues.' Miracles were wrought. The times of the Apostles had returned, and the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church was again restored. The greatest visible monument of Irving's work is in the Cathedral in Gordon Square. He died in 1834.

ROBERT WILLIAM JELF was born in 1798, and was educated at Eton, and Christ Church. In 1820 he was elected Fellow of Oriel. He is the Dr Jelf to whom Newman and Pusey addressed letters on Tract XC. In 1844 he was Principal of King's College, London. It was he who deprived Maurice of his professorship, apparently incapable of understanding his meaning. Jelf died in 1871.

BENJAMIN JOWETT born in 1817 at Camberwell, was educated at St Paul's School and elected to a scholarship in Balliol College in 1835, and to a fellowship in 1838. In 1855 he was Regius Professor of Greek, in 1870 Master of Balliol. Died 1893.

JOHN KEBLE was born in 1792. He was Professor of Poetry from 1813 to 1814, and Vicar of Hursley from 1836 till his death in 1866.

CHARLES KINGSLEY, born in 1819, was educated at Cambridge. In 1844 he became Rector of Eversley, in 1869 Canon of Chester, afterwards of Westminster. Died in 1875.

ALEXANDER KNOX was born in Ireland in 1757. His family came originally from Scotland and claimed connection with that of the great Scottish Reformer. John Wesley was a welcome guest at his father's house, and had a great esteem for young 'Alleck.' Knox was secretary to Lord Castlereagh during the rebellion of 1799, and it was hoped he might enter Parliament, but he preferred devoting his life to the study of theology. In 1801-2 he was in England, and made the acquaintance of Wilberforce, Hannah More and others of the party to which they belonged. He was the life-long friend of Bishop Jebb whom he first knew at school. His lodgings in Dublin are said to have been a resort of much the same kind as that of Coleridge at Highgate. Inquirers went to consult the oracle. The Tractarian movement has been traced to Knox, and through him to Wesley, but these genealogies are often due to the ingenuity of those who make them. This was the subject of an article in the *Contemporary Review* in 1887 by Professor Stokes. It must certainly be admitted that three laymen, Coleridge in England, Erskine in Scotland and Knox in Ireland have had a great influence on the religious thought of the century, and it may be added always for good. Knox died in 1831.

VICESIMUS KNOX was born at Newington Green in 1752. His father who bore the same name was a master of Merchant Tailors' School. The son was at first taught by his father. He was then sent to St John's, Oxford, where he was distinguished as a classical scholar and a man of refined literary taste. His college exercises were printed as a volume of 'Essays' and became very popular. In 1778 he was elected master of Tunbridge School. This office he held for thirty-three years.

During these years he published many miscellaneous papers on education and general literature. He also wrote on politics, taking the side of Fox and the Whigs. Horsley and Porteus, though having no sympathy with his political opinions, very highly commended what he had written on religion. It is said that he would have been a bishop if Fox had had the opportunity to give him promotion.¹

JOHN LINGARD was born at Winchester in 1771. He was educated in France as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. He was eminent as a historian and controversialist, and had a character for moderation and candour. He was Tutor in the College at Ushaw, near Durham. The Queen gave him a pension of £300 a year for his services to literature. Died in 1815.

ALEXANDER McCAUL was born in 1799, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1821 he went to Poland as missionary to the Jews. In 1841 he was Professor of Hebrew in King's College, London, in 1846 Divinity Professor, and in 1850 Rector of St Magnus. Died in 1863.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING was born in 1808. His father was Governor of the Bank of England in 1812-3. He was educated at Harrow, and Balliol College, Oxford. He intended to enter Parliament, but owing to his father's reverses this idea was abandoned. For some time he held a humble position in the Colonial Office. Being persuaded that his vocation was in the Church, he returned to Oxford, and was made Fellow of Lincoln in 1832. He was ordained, on a title to the curacy of Woolavington. He married the Rector's daughter, and on his death succeeded him in the rectory. In 1840 he was made Archdeacon of Chichester. His development in the Roman Catholic direction seems to have been mainly independent of the 'Tracts for the Times.' He thought Tract XC casuistical, and on Guy Fawkes' day 1845 greatly to Newman's annoyance, he preached an anti-popery sermon in Oxford. After Newman's secession he was looked upon as the leader of the advanced High Church party. He made a continental tour, and found it impossible to make the theologians of foreign churches understand the Anglican position. During this tour he was much impressed by the vitality of Romanism, and succeeded in having an interview with the

¹ Annual Biography and Obituary, 1822.

Pope. He returned about the time of the commotion over Hampden's appointment to Hereford. When the State proposed to aid voluntary schools on condition of certain clauses, as the conscience clause, being inserted in Trust Deeds Manning joined Denison and the National Society in their determined opposition. His name appeared at the head of a protest against the decision in the Gorham case. Very few of the clergy signed this protest from which he came to the conclusion that the Anglican Church was no branch of the Church Catholic. He presided at a Non-Popery meeting attended by the clergy of his Archdeaconry, whom he had summoned to attend, but all which he did as president was to protest against the object of the meeting. Soon after this he came to London, and was received into the Roman Catholic Church. He was ordained by Dr Wiseman after which he spent three years in Rome in study, and was on very intimate terms with the Pope. He succeeded Wiseman in the Archbishopric of Westminster in 1864. Died in 1892.

HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL was born in 1820. He was educated at Merchant Tailors' School, and St John's, Oxford. He was a hard student, and a reader of multifarious books from his earliest years. His great controversy with Maurice made him famous ; he always said that Maurice had entirely misrepresented his meaning. In 1866, he was made Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and in 1868, Dean of St Paul's. He died in 1871.

HERBERT MARSH, born in 1758, was educated at St John's College, Cambridge, and at Göttingen. In 1807, he was Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity ; in 1816, Bishop of Llandaff ; in 1819, Bishop of Peterborough. Died 1838.

HARRIET MARTINEAU was born at Norwich at 1802. She was of Huguenot origin as might be inferred from the French name. She was brought up a Unitarian, but gave up all faith in any kind of religion. Died in 1875.

JAMES MARTINEAU was born at Norwich in 1805. He was educated at Norwich Grammar School, at Dr Lant Carpenter's Academy at Bristol, and at Manchester New College. In 1828 he was ordained second minister of the Presbyterian Meeting House in Dublin. In 1832, he was appointed second minister of

Paradise Street Chapel, Liverpool. In 1841, he was made Professor of moral philosophy in Manchester New College, and in 1857 he became minister of Little Portland Street Chapel, London. The University of Leyden made him Doctor of Divinity in 1875, and that of Edinburgh in 1884.

ISAAC AND JOSEPH MILNER were the sons of a poor Yorkshire weaver who died when they were children. They were at first self-taught. By the benevolence of some persons in Leeds Joseph was sent to the Grammar School of that town and afterwards to Cambridge. He became master of the Grammar School at Hull, and Isaac left the loom to be his assistant.

Isaac then got a sizarship at Queen's College, Cambridge. In 1779 he was Senior Wrangler and marked *Incomparabilis*. In 1788 he was elected President of Queen's, in 1792 Dean of Carlisle. He died in 1820 at the house of William Wilberforce.

JOHN MILNER whose real name was Miller was born in 1752. He was educated at Douay. In 1779 he took charge of a mission in Winchester. A committee appointed to attend to the affairs of the Roman Catholic body in England proposed a new oath, which the four Vicars Apostolical in an encyclical letter pronounced unlawful. This letter gave rise to the Blue Books, so called because stitched in blue paper with no regular title. The party represented by the Committee thought the bishops were encroaching on their natural, civil, and religious rights. A large number of the nobility seceded from the Church of Rome. Milner took the side of the Vicars Apostolic, that is he was against the liberal party who called themselves Protesting Catholic Dissenters. In 1798 Milner published his *History of Winchester* which Dr Sturges said was made the vehicle of an apology for popery and a satire on the reformed religion in general, especially that of the Church of England. Joseph Berrington, a Roman Catholic priest of the liberal party, denied that his Church was responsible for Milner's intemperances. He died in 1826.¹

JOHN FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, son of a Unitarian minister, was born in 1805. He went first to Trinity College, and then to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, afterwards to Exeter College, Oxford. He was chaplain of Guy's Hospital, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, professor of Divinity at King's College, Incumbent

¹ See Annual Biography and Obituary, 1827.

of St Peter's, Vere Street, and finally, Professor of Moral Philosophy in Cambridge. His expulsion from King's College with its consequences marks an important stage in the progress of liberal theology in England. Maurice took great interest in the working classes. He and Kingsley were promoters of the Christian socialist movement. He was a very humble, retiring man, and his ardent piety as made known in his biography was an unexpected revelation to those who did not know him. He died in 1872.

JOHN STUART MILL was born in 1806 and died in 1873.

HENRY HART MILMAN was born in 1791. He was educated at Eton, and Brazenose Oxford, and was elected Fellow of his College in 1814. He wrote hymns with his friend Reginald Heber, and had some reputation as a poet. Byron calls him 'the poet priest Milman' supposing him the possible reviewer in the *Quarterly* who killed 'poor Keats.' He was Professor of Poetry in Oxford in 1831. He was author of a play at the performance of which he assisted in the Italian Theatre when he was Dean of St Paul's. His first preferment was to the Rectory of St Mary's, Reading. In 1835 Sir Robert Peel conferred on him the Rectory of St Margaret's, Westminster, with a canonry in the Abbey, and in 1849 Lord John Russell made him Dean of St Paul's. In almost the last year of his life he preached in Oxford at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, the annual sermon on Hebrew Prophecy, when he was able to say 'Thirty-three years ago I published a history of the Jews for which I was in this place denounced and condemned. Having just republished that history, having retracted nothing, softened nothing, changed nothing, I am now in the same place called to preach on the very subject of that history.' He died in 1868.

HANNAH MORE was born in 1745 near Bristol. In this town in early life she kept a school for girls. Her writings had a great influence in promoting earnest religion, and her name is often put with that of Wilberforce as the chief lay representatives of the Evangelical party. She died in 1833.

FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN was born in 1806 and was educated at Worcester College, Oxford. In 1826 he took a double first-class, and in the same year was elected Fellow of Balliol. He resigned his fellowship because of some scruples which he had about infant baptism. He went as a missionary to Bagdad, but

losing faith in Revelation he left his mission work. In 1840 he was elected Classical Professor at Manchester, and in 1846 Latin Professor at University College, London.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN was born in 1801 and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. In 1822 he was elected a Fellow of Oriel. He was received into the Roman Catholic Church in 1845 and in 1873 was elected Cardinal of St George in Velabro. His 'Apologia' was evoked by some remarks of Charles Kingsley in *Macmillan's Magazine* about the Romish clergy having little regard for truth for its own sake. Newman thought that the remarks referred to him. Kingsley had spoken rashly and was willing to apologise, but Newman held him fast and showed him no mercy. Most people would have preferred that Newman's apology for his life and opinions had not been mixed up with an unpleasant controversy. Nobody ever doubted Newman's sincerity, if we except his own brother Francis. If his mind was ever perverted it was unknowingly by his own subtle casuistry. He died in 1890.

BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY NOEL was born in 1793 and was educated at Westminster School, and Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1827 he was chosen minister of St John's Chapel, Bedford Row. The Gorham controversy led him to a special study of the subject of baptism which ended in the conviction that infants should not be baptised. After undergoing immersion he was chosen Pastor of a Baptist congregation. Died in 1873.

JOHN OVERTON was born in 1763 and educated at Magdalen College, Cambridge which at that time was beginning to be associated with the Evangelical party. By the influence of Wilberforce he got the livings of St Crux and St Margaret's, York, which were in the patronage of the Lord Chancellor. The 'True Churchman Ascertained' was held in high esteem by the leading Evangelical clergy. He died in 1838.

WILLIAM PALEY was born at Peterborough in 1743. His father was a Minor Canon of Peterborough, and afterwards head master of the Grammar School of Giggleswick in Yorkshire. In 1758 he was admitted a sizar of Christ's College, Cambridge, and in 1763 was Senior Wrangler. In 1766 he was elected Fellow and Tutor of his college. He made the friendship of Dr Law, master of Peterhouse, who, on his elevation to the see of Carlisle appointed him his chaplain. The Episcopal patronage of Carlisle

is poor. The first benefice to which his patron presented him was Musgrove in Westmoreland, worth £80 a year. To this was soon added the Vicarage of Dalston in Cumberland, and in 1777 he resigned Musgrove and was inducted to the living of Appleby. In 1780 he had a prebendal stall in the Cathedral, in 1782 he was made Archdeacon of Carlisle and in 1785 Chancellor of the diocese. His reputation as a writer began in 1785, when he published his 'Moral and Political Philosophy.' In 1790 he published the *Horæ Paulinæ*. In 1792 the Vicarage of Addingham was added to his other preferments. In that year he published 'Reasons for Contentment' which show that he shared the alarm caused by the French Revolution, that the working classes were to take possession of the property of the rich and make an equal division of it among all persons. In 1794 appeared 'Evidences of Christianity.' He had no chance of a bishopric while Pitt was in office, and probably not at any time under George III, but great preferments were showered upon him. Porteus gave him a stall in St Paul's, Tomline made him sub-dean of Lincoln, and Barrington gave him the very rich Rectory of Bishop Wearmouth. In his 'Moral Philosophy' he had agreed with the agriculturists that tithes were injurious to the cultivation of the land, and acting on his principles he made an arrangement with his tithe payers which turned out greatly to their advantage. He died in 1805.

WILLIAM PALMER of Worcester College as distinguished from William Palmer of Magdalen who became a Roman Catholic, was born in Dublin in 1803, and graduated at Trinity College, Dublin. He was incorporated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and in 1831 removed to Worcester. His 'Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies, brought him into acquaintance with Keble, Newman, and others of that party. In 1846 he became Vicar of Whitchurch, Dorset, and from 1849 to 1858 held a prebend in Salisbury. On the death of his father, he took the title of Sir William Palmer. He died in 1885.

WILLIAM PALMER of Magdalen College was born in 1811. He was brother to Roundell Palmer Earl of Selborne. He went to Russia with introductions to the Chief Russian Ecclesiastics to try to get them to acknowledge the English Church as a true branch of the Church Catholic. This was unanimously refused. He tried several times to be admitted to the Communion

in the Russian Church, but was told that he must first be baptised. In 1855 he was received into the Roman Catholic Church. He died in 1879.

SAMUEL PARR, more famous as a Greek scholar than as a theologian, was born at Harrow on the Hill in 1747. His father was a surgeon, but he belonged to a clerical family. In 1752 he was admitted on the foundation of the Free School at Harrow. His early school companions were Sir William Jones and Dr Bennet, who died Bishop of Cloyne. In 1765 he was entered at Emmanuel, Cambridge. In 1767 he became assistant Master at Harrow, and two years later was ordained by Dr Terrick, Bishop of London. He held the curacies of Willesden and Kingsbury, the duties of which he performed along with those of the school. Disappointed in his candidature for the mastership of Harrow, he opened a school at Stanmore. In 1777 he obtained the Head Mastership of the school at Colchester, and two years later succeeded to that of Norwich. To this was added the living of Asterley in Lincolnshire, worth £36 a year, which was resigned for that of Hatton in Warwickshire, worth about £90. Lord Dartmouth asked Chancellor Thurlow to give Parr a prebendal stall in Norwich. Thurlow refused with an oath. Bishop Lowth was persuaded to give him one in St Paul's with about £17 a year. Parr was famous in many literary and political fights. He became a Whig, and was an ardent supporter of Fox, a sworn enemy of Pitt, taking the side of the Americans in the great war of independence. Deaneries and bishoprics were often looming before him, but he never reached them. He lived by his school. It was said that his political friends even if they had had the opportunity would never have nominated him to a bishopric. Though an upright and earnest man, his habits were those of a jovial scholar. His biographer sets forth his qualifications for the episcopal office from his knowledge of theology and his great learning. 'He was less arrogant than Warburton, not less orthodox than Law, gentle as Fénelon, and eloquent as Bossuet. Though the pipe was his closest companion, his hospitality was noble,' and it is added 'his love of state, perhaps of pomp, would have done all besides that general usage demanded from the episcopal character.'¹ Died in 1825.

MARK PATTISON was born in 1813, and matriculated at Oriel

¹ Works, Vol. I 592.

in 1832. His great ambition was to be a Fellow of a College. After many disappointments in 1839 he was elected Fellow of Lincoln. In 1861, very soon after the publication of 'Essays and Reviews,' he became Master of Lincoln. Died in 1884.

HENRY PHILLPOTTS was born in 1778. His father owned and kept the Bell Inn in Gloucester, the same inn which was kept by George Whitfield's mother. He was also estate agent to the Dean and Chapter. Phillpotts was educated at Gloucester Grammar School and at Corpus Christi, Oxford. In 1795 he was chosen a Fellow of Magdalen. His first benefice was the Vicarage of Kilmersden near Bath. In 1805 he went to Durham and for twenty years was chaplain to Bishop Barrington, who loaded him with great preferments, till he reached the greatest of all—the Rectory of Stanhope. In 1830 he was offered the See of Exeter, worth £3000 a year, but he could not afford to take it as Stanhope was worth £4000. He wished to hold his Rectory with the bishopric, but the parishioners protested against the income going out of the parish, and their being left in charge of some 'hireling.' A canon of Durham exchanged his canonry for Stanhope, and so Phillpotts held the poor bishopric and the rich canonry. Died in 1869.

BEILBY PORTEUS was born at York in 1731. His father and mother were natives of Virginia. They had left America for the advantages of education for their children but the income from their estates so rapidly declined that Beilby was glad to accept a sizarship at Christ's College, Cambridge. In 1752 he was elected Fellow of his College. In 1757 he was ordained deacon by Bishop Thomas of Lincoln, and soon after priest by Hutton, Archbishop of York, when he was chosen to preach the ordination sermon. He returned to the University as Fellow and Tutor till in 1762 Archbishop Secker appointed him his examining chaplain. In 1765 he was presented to the livings of Rucking and Wittersham in Kent, which were afterwards resigned for the Rectory of Hunton. He was also made a Prebendary of Peterborough, and in 1767 his patron conferred on him the Rectory of Lambeth. In 1769 he was appointed Chaplain to the King, soon after he obtained the Mastership of the Hospital of St Cross near Winchester, and in 1776 the See of Chester. In 1781 he was instrumental in getting a bill passed called 'An Act for preventing certain Abuses and Profanations on the Lord's Day, commonly

called Sunday.' This arose out of an attempt of some Sunday societies to establish Sunday evening entertainments for admission to which charges were to be made. The Bishop regarded this as a beginning to introduce the Continental Sunday into England. In 1783 he preached the sermon for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in which he earnestly pleaded for the instruction of the slaves in the West Indies, but the Society decided that that was undesirable. He was one of the first promoters of Sunday Schools, which he recommended to all his clergy, giving plans and rules for conducting them.

In 1787 Porteus was translated to London. He was at Hunton, which living he held while Bishop of Chester, when he received from Pitt the letter announcing that the King approved of his nomination. Porteus was altogether an active practical bishop. One of his first acts was to support a society lately established 'for enforcing the King's Proclamation against Immorality and Profaneness,' a society which secured for this purpose many useful Acts of Parliament, as the prohibition of licentious books and indecent prints. He tried to enforce the residence of the clergy on their benefices, to increase the salaries of curates, and to prevent various kinds of simony as bonds of resignation and a custom which he effectually checked as exemplified in the case of a rich living in Essex, where the advowson was bought and then a ninety-nine years' lease of the tithes, etc., taken at a pepper-corn rent. He died in 1809.

BADEN POWELL was born in 1796 and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1821 he was appointed Vicar of Plumstead. From 1827 to 1860 he was Savilian Professor of Geometry. He died in 1860.

EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY was born in 1800 at Pusey in Berkshire. He was descended from a family of Flemish refugees. He was educated at Eton, and Christ Church Oxford, and elected Fellow of Oriel in 1823. He went for some time to Germany to learn the German language and to become acquainted with German theological literature. On his return in 1827 he was elected Professor of Hebrew. In 1843 he was suspended for three years from the office of preaching because of a sermon on the real presence in the Eucharist which was deemed contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. He died in 1882.

THOMAS RENNELL was born at Winchester in 1787. His father who survived him was Dean of Winchester and Master of the Temple. He was sent at an early age to Eton, and in 1806 he proceeded to King's College, Cambridge. He was Browne's medallist in 1808. When he took orders he was appointed by his father Assistant Preacher at the Temple, and soon after he undertook the editorship of the *British Critic*. In 1816 Bishop Howley presented him to the Vicarage of Kensington, and in the same year he was elected Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. He attended lectures on anatomy and physiology at a London Hospital that he might be qualified to speak of the relations of science to religion. He believed the biological theories of Bichat, Morgan and Laurence to be irreligious, tending to atheism. He was for some years examining chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury, who in 1823 appointed him to the mastership of St Nicholas Hospital with a prebend in the Church of Salisbury. In the same year he defended the Church and Clergy in a Letter to Lord Brougham on his Durham Speech, and the three articles in the *Edinburgh Review* on the Clergy. Great things were expected from Rennell. He was called the young Marcellus of the Church. Dr Parr wrote that 'by profound erudition, by various and extensive knowledge, by a well-formed taste, by keen discernment, by glowing and majestic eloquence, by morals correct without austerity, and by fervent piety without superstition, the son of the Dean of Winchester stands among the brightest luminaries of our national literature and our national Church.'¹ He died in 1824.²

LEGH RICHMOND was born at Liverpool in 1772, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge in 1789. His first curacy was in the Isle of Wight. He was afterwards Chaplain at the Lock Hospital. In 1805, he was presented to the Rectory of Turvey in Bedfordshire. He died in 1827.

FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON was born in 1816, and was educated at the Edinburgh Academy and at Edinburgh University. He spent a year in a solicitor's office in Bury St Edmund's, which he left with the intention of taking a commission in the

¹ Letter to Dr Milner.

² See Biography by his friend John Lonsdale, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, in the Annual Biography and Obituary, copied from the 'Christian Remembrancer.'

army, but the conviction came strongly upon him that his true calling was that of a preacher. In 1837, he was entered at Brazenose. He lived retired, and devoted much time to the study of the Scriptures. He felt the attraction of Newman's influence, but clung to the Evangelical theology. He was ordained in 1840, and from 1842 to 1846, he was Curate of Christ Church, Cheltenham. His faith in Evangelicalism became shaken by the intolerance and narrowness of its partisans. After a tour on the Continent, he accepted the Curacy of St Ebbe's, Oxford, where his power as a preacher began to be felt. In 1842, he went to Trinity Chapel, Brighton, where he soon gained a great reputation as a preacher, and as a friend of the working classes. His sermons, published after his death, though not written for publication had an immense circulation. He died in 1853.

THOMAS ROBINSON was born at Wakefield in 1749, and was entered at Trinity, Cambridge, in 1768. He was seventh wrangler the same year in which Tomline was senior. In 1772, he was elected Fellow of Trinity. In 1778, he was presented to the living of St Mary's, Leicester. Died in 1813.

HUGH JAMES ROSE was born in 1795, and educated at Trinity, Cambridge. In 1821 he was presented to the Vicarage of Horsham in Sussex, which he resigned in 1822. In 1830 he was instituted to the Rectory of Hadleigh which he exchanged for St Thomas's, Southwark. In 1832 he started the *British Magazine*, and in 1833 he was Professor of Divinity in Durham. In 1834 he was domestic chaplain to Archbishop Howley, and in 1836 Principal of King's College, London. He died in 1838.

CHARLES SIMEON was born in 1759 and educated at Eton and King's College. For fifty-three years he was Rector of Trinity Church, Cambridge. He died in 1836.

JOHN PYE SMITH was born at Sheffield in 1774. He was bound apprentice for three years to his father, who was a bookseller and bookbinder. When his apprenticeship was ended he believed his proper vocation was that of preacher. He was admitted to the Nonconformist Academy in Rotherham in 1796. In 1801 he became Tutor of Homerton Academy and in the year following he was ordained to the pastoral office, his flock being

the students and his own family. He retired in 1850 and died in 1851.

SYDNEY SMITH was born in 1771, was educated at Winchester, and New College Oxford. In 1790 he was elected Fellow of his college. He was the first Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, that is he edited the first number. He humorously proposed as a motto a free translation of a line in Virgil, 'we cultivate literature on a little oatmeal.' This was in allusion to what Burns calls 'the halesome parritch.' He had a living in Yorkshire, then a stall in Bristol Cathedral, and finally he was a Canon Residentiary of St Paul's. He was a liberal politician and a Church Reformer, but he objected to the more equitable distribution of ecclesiastical property. His argument was that there should be some well endowed offices in the way of prizes. He was a great talker and a great favourite in society. Byron said of him 'to brilliant dinners out while but a Curate.' Died in 1845.

ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY was born in 1815, and educated at Rugby, and Balliol Oxford. In 1829 he was elected Fellow of University College. From 1841 to 1851 he lived at Oxford as Tutor of his college. He was made a Canon of Canterbury in 1851. He was afterwards Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Oxford and Canon of Christ Church, and in 1863 Dean of Westminster. Died in 1881.

JOHN BIRD SUMNER was born in 1780. He was educated at Eton, and at King's Cambridge. After taking orders he became assistant master at Eton, and then Rector of Maple Durham in Oxfordshire. Barrington gave him a canonry in Durham Cathedral. In 1828 he was made Bishop of Chester and in 1848 Archbishop of Canterbury. Died in 1862.

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT was born in Edinburgh in 1811, educated at the Edinburgh High School and Academy, and at the University of Glasgow. He went to Balliol College, Oxford from Glasgow on the Snell foundation. He became Fellow and Tutor of his College, and in 1842 succeeded Arnold as Master of Rugby. In 1850 he was made Dean of Carlisle and in 1856 Bishop of London. In 1869 he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. Died in 1882.

JOHN JAMES TAYLER was born at Newington Butts, in 1797. He studied at Glasgow University and in Germany. He was Principal of Manchester New College, and was much esteemed as a Unitarian preacher and writer. Died in 1869.

ISAAC TAYLOR was born in 1785. He was the son of a Congregationalist minister and received his education from his father. He died in 1865.

FREDERICK TEMPLE was born in 1821 and was educated at Tiverton and Balliol College. He graduated double first-class and became Fellow and Tutor of his College. He was in succession, Principal of Kneller Hall Training College, Inspector of Schools, Head Master of Rugby, Bishop of Exeter and now of London.

CONNOP THIRLWALL was born in 1797 and was educated at the Charterhouse and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was consecrated Bishop of St David's in 1840. Died 1875.

GEORGE PRETYMAN OR TOMLINE was born at Bury St Edmund's in 1753. In a biography in Cassan's *Bishops of Winchester* written while the Bishop was living, his genealogy is traced to Suffolk landowners through the last six hundred years. In another biography written after the Bishop's death he is said to have been the son of a tradesman. He was educated at the Grammar School of Bury St Edmund's, and at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. In 1772 he was Senior Wrangler and obtained Smith's Prize. Next year he was Fellow and Tutor of his College. Among his pupils was William Pitt who became his patron and life-long friend. In 1782 when Pitt was made Chancellor of the Exchequer he appointed Pretymán his private secretary. In the same year Bishop Shipley of St Asaph's gave him a sinecure Rectory in Wales, and in 1784 Pitt gave him a prebendal stall in Westminster. Next year he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society and presented by the King to the Rectory of Sudbourne in Suffolk, and in 1787 he was raised to the see of Lincoln. Here he continued for thirty-two years, and his biographer records as a marvel that he held eleven visitations or one every three years which none of his predecessors were known to have done. In 1803 a large fortune was left him on condition of his taking the name of Tomline. In 1813 he declined the bishopric of London,

but in 1820 he accepted that of Winchester, which he held till his death in 1827.

WILLIAM VAN MILDERT was born in London in 1765. As the name indicates, he was of Dutch origin. His grandfather who settled in London as a merchant had emigrated from Amsterdam. William was baptised by Bishop Horsley when Rector of Newington. The Bishop strongly advised his father to bring up his son to business, but the son thought he had another calling. He was educated at Merchant Tailor's School and at Queen's, Oxford. He was ordained in 1788, and in 1795 was presented by a relation to the Rectory of Bradden in Northamptonshire. Next year he was presented by the Grocers' Company, to whom he was chaplain, to the Rectory of St Mary le Bow. Here he was prosecuted for non-residence. He pleaded that there was no parsonage, but a verdict was obtained against him from the consequences of which he was delivered by an Act of Parliament, which relieved many others in a similar condition. He had not been long in London when he was appointed to preach Lady Moyer's Lecture at St Paul's Cathedral. In 1802-1805 he preached the Boyle Lectures, for which Archbishop Sutton gave him the Vicarage of Farningham in Kent. In 1812 he was elected preacher of Lincoln's Inn. In 1813 he was appointed by Lord Liverpool, Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford. In 1814 he was Bampton Lecturer. In 1819 he was made Bishop of Llandaff, and in the year following Dean of St Paul's. He resigned his professorship but seems to have held all his other preferments. In 1826 he was translated to the See of Durham. Died 1836.¹

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD was born in London in 1812. He was entered at Christ Church as a commoner, and in 1834 was elected Fellow of Balliol. He was deprived of his degree of M.A. in 1845 by the Convocation of the University, shortly after which he joined the Church of Rome. He was for many years Editor of the *Dublin Review*. He died in 1882.

RALPH WARDLAW was born at Dalkeith in 1779. He was a preacher of some eminence in Glasgow and Professor of Theology in the Independent Academy of the same town. He died in 1853.

¹ See Annual Biography and Obituary, 1837.

RICHARD WATSON was born at Haversham near Kendal in 1737. His father was a clergyman, and for forty years Master of the Grammar School in that place. An exhibition belonging to the school took him as a sizar to Trinity College, Cambridge, which he entered in 1755. His biographer says that 'his true blue worsted stockings and coarse, mottled coat, both of which doubtless evinced themselves of home manufacture, together with a northern or provincial accent are still commemorated by tradition in the annals of that celebrated institution.' Some knowledge of classics he must have taken with him to Cambridge, but he had never learned to make Latin or Greek verse, and could not remember when a syllable was long or short. But no difficulties were too great for him. He obtained a scholarship and gave up his sizarship. He stood high among the wranglers, and in due course was Fellow and Tutor of his college. In 1764 he was elected Professor of Chemistry, and in 1771, Regius Professor of Divinity. He was made a member of the Royal Society, a prebendary of Ely, in 1780 Archdeacon of the diocese, and in 1782 consecrated Bishop of Llandaff. At an early stage in his University career, he gained the friendship of Dr Law, Master of Peterhouse, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, the representative of the liberal spirit which then prevailed in Cambridge. His theology was founded entirely on the Bible, and his politics were those of the Whigs who denounced the American War as unjust. When made Professor of Divinity he wrote, 'My mind was wholly unbiassed, and I had no prejudice against and no predilection for the Church of England, but a sincere regard for the Church of Christ, and an insuperable objection to every degree of dogmatic intolerance.' With the New Testament in his hand he would say, '*En codicem sacrum*: here is the fountain of truth; why do you follow the streams derived from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the errors of men.' Having a large fortune left to him, Bishop Watson purchased an estate in his native Westmoreland, where he spent the last years of his life, devoting much of his time to agriculture. He is often reproached with having neglected his diocese, but in those days a bishop was not expected to do more than his official duties. His health was indifferent, and there was no episcopal residence in Llandaff. He died in 1816.¹

RICHARD WATSON, a Wesleyan preacher of some eminence

¹ Annual Obituary, 1817.

and theological writer was born at Burton-on-Humber in 1781. He was educated at Lincoln Grammar School, and was apprenticed for seven years to a carpenter and joiner. He died in 1833.

ISAAC WILLIAMS was born in 1802. He was educated at Harrow, and at Trinity College, Oxford. He was Fellow of his college in 1831. Died in 1865.

ROWLAND WILLIAMS was born in 1817. In 1828 he went to Eton and in 1836 to King's College, Cambridge. In 1839 he was elected Fellow of his college. In 1850 he was Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in Lampeter College. In 1858 he became Vicar of Broadchalke. Died in 1870.

RICHARD WHATELY was born in 1787 and entered Oriel College in 1805. In 1825 he was appointed Principal of St Alban's Hall, and in 1831 Archbishop of Dublin. He died in 1863.

JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE was born at Seville in 1775 and ordained priest in 1798. He came to England in 1810 and was admitted a member of Oriel College. From 1833 to 1835 he was Tutor to Archbishop Whately's family. When he ceased to believe in the Trinity he fled to Liverpool. He died in 1841.

WILLIAM WHEWELL was born at Lancaster in 1794. He was the son of a carpenter, and was intended for the same trade, but having distinguished himself at the Grammar School of Lancaster the master found the means of sending him to Cambridge. He was entered at Trinity, and became in due time a Fellow of his college. He was Professor of Mineralogy, then of Moral Philosophy, and in 1841 Master of Trinity. He fell from his horse which caused his death in 1866.

ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE was born in 1803. He was elected Fellow of Oriel in 1826, was received into the Roman Catholic Church in 1856, and died in 1857.

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE was born in 1805, and educated at Oriel. In 1839 he was appointed Archdeacon, and in 1840 Canon of Winchester, and in 1845 Dean of Westminster and

Bishop of Oxford. In 1869 he was translated to Winchester. He met his death by falling from his horse in 1873.

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE was born in 1759. He was educated at St John's, Cambridge. He died in 1833.

HENRY BRISTOW WILSON was born in 1807, matriculated at St John's in 1821, and was elected Fellow and Tutor. From 1839 to 1854 he was Professor of Anglo-Saxon. In 1850 he took the college living of Great Staughton in Hunts. Died in 1888.

NICHOLAS PATRICK STEPHEN WISEMAN was born at Seville in 1802. He was descended from an old English family which had settled at Seville and at Waterford in Ireland. He had in him the blood or bloods of several nationalities. He was educated at Rome, where he became Professor of Oriental Languages, and afterwards Rector of the English College. He came to England as Bishop of Melipotamus being a Bishop *in partibus*. The Pope made him Archbishop of Westminster when the Roman Catholic hierarchy was re-established in England. He was one of the founders of the *Dublin Review* and at one time Editor. Died in 1865.

BISHOPS OF THE CENTURY

CANTERBURY

1783 JOHN MOORE
1805 CHARLES MANNERS SUTTON
1828 WILLIAM HOWLEY
1848 JOHN BIRD SUMNER
1862 CHARLES THOMAS LONGLEY
1868 ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT
1883 EDWARD WHITE BENSON

ST ASAPH

1802 SAMUEL HORSLEY
1806 WILLIAM CLEAVER
1815 JOHN LUXMORE
1820 WILLIAM CAREY
1846 THOMAS VOWLER SHORT
1870 JOSHUA HUGHES
1889 ALFRED G. EDWARDS

BANGOR

1800 WILLIAM CLEAVER
1807 JOHN RANDOLPH
1809 HENRY WILLIAM MAJENDIE
1830 CHRISTOPHER BETHELL
1859 JOHN COLQUHOUN CAMPBELL
1890 DAVID LEWIS LLOYD

BATH and WELLS

1802 RICHARD BEADON
1824 GEORGE HENRY LAW
1845 RICHARD BAGOT
1854 ROBERT JOHN EDEN (BARON
AUCKLAND)
1869 LORD ARTHUR CHARLES HERVEY
1895 J. W. KENNION

BRISTOL

1802 GEORGE PELHAM
1808 WILLIAM LORT MANSEL
1820 JOHN KAYE
1827 ROBERT GRAY

1834 JOSEPH ALLEN
1836 JAMES H. MONK

CHICHESTER

1797 JOHN BUCKNER
1824 ROBERT JAMES CARR
1831 EDWARD MALTBY
1836 WILLIAM OTTER
1840 PHIL. N. SHUTTLEWORTH
1842 ASHURST E. GILBERT
1870 RICHARD DURNFORD
1896 E. R. WILBERFORCE

ST DAVID'S

1800 GEORGE MURRAY
1803 THOMAS BURGESS
1825 JOHN BANKS JENKINSON
1840 CONNOP THIRLWALL
1874 WILLIAM BASIL JONES

ELY

1781 JAMES YORK
1808 THOMAS DAMPIER
1812 BOWYER EDWARD SPARKE
1836 JOSEPH ALLEN
1845 THOMAS TURTON
1864 EDWARD H. BROWNE
1873 JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD
1886 LORD ALWYNE COMPTON

EXETER

1797 HENRY REGINALD COURTENAY
1803 JOHN FISHER
1807 GEORGE PELHAM
1820 WILLIAM CAREY
1830 CHRISTOPHER BETHELL
1831 HENRY PHILLPOTTS
1869 FREDERICK TEMPLE
1885 E. H. BICKERSTETH

GLOUCESTER

- 1802 GEORGE ISAAC HUNTINGFORD
- 1815 HENRY RYDER
- 1824 CHRISTOPHER BETHELL
- 1830 JAMES H. MONK
- 1856 CHARLES BARING
- 1861 WILLIAM THOMSON
- 1863 CHARLES J. C. ELLICOTT

HEREFORD

- 1788 JOHN BUTLER
- 1803 FOLLIOT H. W. CORNWALL
- 1808 JOHN LUXMORE
- 1815 GEORGE ISAAC HUNTINGDON
- 1832 EDWARD GRAY
- 1837 THOMAS MUSGRAVE
- 1848 RENN D. HAMPDEN
- 1868 JAMES ATLAY
- 1895 J. PERCIVAL

LINCOLN

- 1787 GEORGE PRETYMAN TOMLINE
- 1820 GEORGE PELHAM
- 1827 JOHN KAYE
- 1853 JOHN JACKSON
- 1869 CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH
- 1885 EDWARD KING

LLANDAFF

- 1782 RICHARD WATSON
- 1816 HERBERT MARSH
- 1819 WILLIAM VAN MILDERT
- 1826 CHARLES R. SUMNER
- 1828 EDWARD COPLESTON
- 1849 ALFRED OLIVANT
- 1883 RICHARD LEWIS

LICHFIELD and COVENTRY

- 1781 JAMES CORNWALLIS
- 1804 HENRY RYDER
- 1830 SAMUEL BUTLER
- 1840 JAMES BOWSTEAD
- 1843 JOHN LONSDALE
- 1867 GEORGE AUGUSTUS SELWYN
- 1878 WILLIAM D. MACLAGAN
- 1891 HON. A. LEGGE

LONDON

- 1787 BEILBY PORTEUS
- 1809 JOHN RANDOLPH
- 1813 WILLIAM HOWLEY
- 1828 CHARLES JAMES BLUMFIELD
- 1855 ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT
- 1869 JOHN JACKSON
- 1885 FREDERICK TEMPLE

NORWICH

- 1792 CHARLES MANNERS SUTTON
- 1805 HENRY BATHURST
- 1837 EDWARD STANLEY
- 1849 SAMUEL HINDS
- 1857 JOHN T. PELHAM
- 1893 JOHN SHEEPSHANKS

OXFORD

- 1799 JOHN RANDOLPH
- 1807 CHARLES MOSS
- 1812 WILLIAM JACKSON
- 1815 EDWARD LEGGE
- 1827 CHARLES LLOYD
- 1829 RICHARD BAGOT
- 1845 SAMUEL WILBERFORCE
- 1870 JOHN FIELDER MACKARNES
- 1888 WILLIAM STUBBS

PETERBOROUGH

- 1794 SPENCER MADAN
- 1813 JOHN PARSONS
- 1819 HERBERT MARSH
- 1839 GEORGE DAVYS
- 1864 FRANCIS JEUNE
- 1868 WILLIAM CONNOR MAGEE
- 1891 MICHAEL CREIGHTON

ROCHESTER

- 1793 SAMUEL HORSLEY
- 1802 THOMAS DAMPIER
- 1808 WALTER KING
- 1827 HUGH PERCY
- 1827 GEORGE MURRAY
- 1860 JOSEPH COTTON WIGRAM
- 1867 THOMAS LEIGH CLAUGHTON
- 1877 ANTHONY WILSON THOROLD
- 1891 RANDALL T. DAVIDSON
- 1895 E. S. TALBOT

SALISBURY

- 1791 JOHN DOUGLAS
- 1807 JOHN FISHER
- 1825 THOMAS BURGESS
- 1837 EDWARD DENISON
- 1854 WALTER KER HAMILTON
- 1869 GEORGE MOBERLY
- 1885 JOHN WORDSWORTH

SOUTHWELL

- 1884 G. RIDDING

ST ALBANS

- 1877 T. L. CLAUGHTON
- 1890 JOHN WOGAN FESTING

TRURO

- 1877 E. W. BENSON
1883 GEORGE HOWARD WILKINSON
1891 JOHN GOTT

WINCHESTER

- 1781 BROWNLOW NORTH
1820 GEORGE PRETYMAN TOMLINE
1827 CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER
1869 SAMUEL WILBERFORCE
1873 E. H. BROWNE
1891 A. W. THOROLD
1895 R. T. DAVIDSON

WORCESTER

- 1781 RICHARD HURD
1803 FOLIOT HERBERT WALKER
CORNWALL
1831 ROBERT JAMES CARR
1841 HENRY PEPYS
1861 HENRY PHILPOT
1891 J. J. S. PEROWNE

YORK

- 1770 WILLIAM MARKHAM
1808 EDWARD HARCOURT
1847 THOMAS MUSGRAVE
1860 CHARLES THOMAS LONGLEY
1862 WILLIAM THOMSON
1890 W. C. MAGEE
1891 WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN

CARLISLE

- 1791 EDWARD VENABLES VERNON
1808 SAMUEL GOODENOUGH
1827 HUGH PERCY
1856 HENRY MONTAGU VILLIERS
1860 SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE
1869 HARVEY GOODWIN
1892 J. W. BARDSLEY

CHESTER

- 1800 HENRY WILLIAM MAJENDIE
1809 BOWYER EDWARD SPARKE
1812 GEORGE HENRY LAW
1824 CHARLES JAMES BLOMFIELD
1828 JOHN BIRD SUMNER
1848 JOHN GRAHAM

- 1865 WILLIAM JACOBSON
1884 WILLIAM STUBBS
1888 F. JOHN JAYNE

DURHAM

- 1791 SHUTE BARRINGTON
1826 WILLIAM VAN MILDERT
1836 EDWARD MALTBY
1856 CHARLES T. LONGLEY
1860 H. M. VILLIERS
1861 CHARLES BARING
1879 JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT
1890 BROOK F. WESTCOTT

MANCHESTER

- 1848 JAMES PRINCE LEE
1870 JAMES FRASER
1886 JAMES MOORHOUSE

LIVERPOOL

- 1880 JOHN CHARLES RYLE

NEWCASTLE

- 1882 E. R. WILBERFORCE
1896 EDGAR JACOB

RIPON

- 1836 CHARLES THOMAS LONGLEY
1857 ROBERT BICKERSTETH
1884 WILLIAM BOYD CARPENTER

SODOR and MAN


- 1784 CLAUDIUS CRIGAN
1813 GEORGE MURRAY
1827 WILLIAM WARD
1838 JAMES BOWSTEAD
1840 HENRY PEPYS
1841 THOMAS VOWLER SHORT
1847 WALTER A. SHIRLEY
1847 JOHN ROBERT EDEN
1854 HENRY POWYS
1877 ROWLEY HILL
1887 JOHN WAREING BARDSLEY
1892 N. D. J. STRATON

WAKEFIELD

- 1888 WILLIAM WALSHAM HOW

Date Due

APR 30 1988			

JUN 15 1990			
	PRINTED	IN U. S. A.	

